



1125-2.8.

A N.

ANSWER

T O

Mr. *Dodwell* and Dr. *Sberlocke* ;

Confuting an Universal Humane Church-Supremacy, Aristocratical and Monarchical ; as Church-Tyranny and Popery : And defending Dr. *Isaac Barrow's* Treatise against it.

By *Richard Baxter* . .

Preparatory to a fuller Treatise against such an Universal Sovereignty, as contrary to Reason, Christianity, the Protestant Profession and the Church of *England* ; though the Corrupters usurp that Title.

L O N D O N :

Printed for *Thomas Parkhurst*, at the Bible and Three Crowns, at the lower end of *Cheapside*, near *Mercers Chappel*, 1682.



NEW YORK

READER,

T Hough the difference between Mr. Dodwell (and Mr. Thorndike, and such others), and those condemned by them, be very great, I would not have it seem greater than it is. The sum of it is as followeth:

1. Mr. Dodwell thinketh that there is no true Ministry, Church-Sacraments, nor Covenant-right to pardon and salvation, but where there is a Ministry delivering the Sacraments, who were ordained by Bishops (in his sense of Bishops), who had their Ordination from other Bishops, and they from others, by an uninterrupted chain of succession from the Apostles.

We know, that by this Doctrine he condemneth, or unchurcheth, not only the Reformed Churches, the Greeks and other Easterns, but the Church of Rome it self, and leaveth no certainty of the very being of any one Church on earth.

And we maintain, that the sacred Scripture is the universal Law of Christ, in which he hath described and instituted the office and work of the sacred Ministry, and appointed the way of their continuance in the world, by necessary Qualification, Election, Consent, and ordinarily regular Ordination. That as Presbyters now lay on hands with the Bishop; so senior Pastors are the Ordainers, as the Colledg of Physicians license Physicians, and the Convocation of Doctors make Doctors (and man generateth man). But to avoid contention and division, the Churches have used to make one of these Presbyters or Pastors a President, and partly a Ruler in each Colledg and Church, and given him a Ne-

gative voice in Ordinations; against which we strive not, but maintain, 1. That his consent is not so necessary, as that no one can be a true Presbyter that hath it not. As the Clergy at Rome in Cyprian's days long governed when they had no Bishop; so if the Bishop be dead, or refuse to ordain, or would ordain none but Hereticks, or uncapable men; or would tyrannize and impose men not consented to, the Ordination is valid that is made without him. And 2. That the true chief Pastor of every particular formed Church, is a true Bishop, though Diocesans should deny it. 3. And that even Ordination it self is necessary but for Order where it may be had, and not to the Being of the Ministry where it cannot be had on lawful terms, no more than Coronation to the King, or publick solemnization to Marriage. 4. And we are assured, that if Regular Ordination were interrupted by death, heresie, refusal, neglect, e. g. at Antioch, Alexandria, Constantinople, Jerusalem, &c. Christs Charter, or Scripture-Law would presently restore it to persons duly qualified, chosen and ordained by the fittest there that can be had. 5. If this were not so (as multitudes of schismatical and unlawful Popes Ordinations at Rome would be invalid, e. g. John 13. and 21. and 23. and Eugenius 4th deposed as a Heretick by a General Council, &c.) so every usurping Bishop that pretendeth falsely, that he was himself lawfully ordained, would nullifie Churches, Ministry and Sacraments of all ordained by him. And many have falsely pretended to Orders. 6. And that if men must refuse the Government and Sacraments of all Bishops and Presbyters that do not prove to them a Regular Ordination uninterrupted for 1600. years, all the Ministry on earth may be refused: and none for so doing should be called Schismatics. I never yet heard or saw a Bishop prove such a succession, nor ever knew one that would take his Oath on it, that he was a true Bishop on such terms.

II. Mr

II. Mr. Dodwell thinks that the Presbyters, yea and Bishops, were not given by God. Pag. 60. saith he, But where do they find, that God ever gave Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons? Where note, that it is of the Office in specie that we speake.

But we think that God hath made or instituted the Office and its work. And if he did not, 1. Who did? If men, was it Clergymen or Laymen? If Laymen, was it Christians or Infidels? And by what Authority? Do the children beget the fathers, and yet may not Presbyters propagate their species? If Clergymen, who were they? If not Apostles, or Prophets, or Evangelists, they were none. If these, then it seems the Apostles did it not as Bishops; for it is the making of the first Bishops that we question. And what the Apostles did (not as Bishops, but) as commissioned Apostles, Christ did by his Spirit. And they that will do the like, must have the like Office, Authority and Spirit. If God gave not Bishops, because the Apostles made them, then God gave us not the Scripture, because the Apostles and Evangelists wrote it.

And is not this the same or worse Doctrine than that which the Italian Jesuits would have had pass at Trent, against Gods making Bishops or their Office?

And if God gave not Bishops or Presbyters, they that reject them, reject no gift or institution of God.

And if men made them, how come they to be essential to the Church? Did not Christ and his Spirit in the Apostles, institute so much as the Church essentials?

And if men made Bishops and Presbyters in specie, may not man unmake them?

III. Mr. Dodwell maintaineth, that the power of Presbyters is to be measured by the intention of the Ordainers who give it them, and not by any Scripture-institution, charter or description.

We

We maintain the contrary, that God having instituted and described the Office of Bishops, Pastors, Presbyters, Gods Law in Scripture is the Rule by which the office-power, and obligation, and work in the essentials, must be known. Otherwise, It would be supposed, that God made not the office of Bishops or Presbyters; which is false.

2. *That Ordainers may make new Churches, Bishops or Presbyters in specie; yea, as many species of them as they shall intend.*

3. *That they may abrogate or change the ancient species. They may make one office only for preaching, another only for praying, another only for Baptism, another only for the Lords Supper, and others for new work of their own. The Papists themselves abhor this Doctrine.*

4. *Then no man can know the measure of his Authority, not knowing the intentions of the Ordainers. Perhaps three or ten ordaining Bishops may have three or ten several intents.*

5. *Then the Bishop may put down Gods Worship or Sacraments, by limiting the Priests power.*

6. *It's contrary to all Ministerial Investitures. The Investing Minister is not the Owner or the Donor, but delivereth possession of what the Owner and Donor contracted for, or gave. If the Archbishop, Crowning the King, would infringe his Prerogative, it's a Nullity, because he is not the Giver of it; nor is his intention, but the Kingdoms constitution, the measure of it. If the Priest would make the man whom he marrieth to a woman, no governour of her, it's a Nullity: for it is not his intent that makes the power.*

7. *If this were otherwise, I call and call again (but in vain) to Mr. Dodwell, and all his party, to tell me, how the Bishops and Priests of the Church of England in the days of Henry the 8th, and Edward the 6th, and Queen Elizabeth came to have power to put down the Mass, to set up the Liturgy,*

Liturgie, to take down Images, and to reform as they did, when it was certainly contrary to the intention of their Ordainers?

8. *And setting this point together with the other, (that Ordination of Presbyters is null) I ask them, (and ask again, but all in vain;) 1. Do not Bishops generate their Species, and make Bishops their equals? 2. Who then can give his Office to the Archbishop, if he have no Superior in England, unless his Inferiors give it, or you fly to a Foreign Jurisdiction? 3. Whose Intention is it that giveth power to the Pope, if he be greatest? Or to the General Council, if it be greatest? If there be none above them, either God or Inferiours give them their power? 4. And what if these Inferiours that make Popes, Primates, or Councils, by Intention would take down half their power? Is it then done? What self-contradiction and confusion would some men rather run into, than grant Christ to be Christ? that is, the only Universal Head and Legislator to the Church on Earth.*

IV. *Accordingly Mr. D. holdeth, that there is a supreme Authority in man over the Universal Church, from whose intention and sense it is not lawful for us to appeal so much as to the Sacred Scripture, no nor to the Day of Judgment, for any practice different from them. See his Reply, p. 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85.*

Though we hold that no unjust Appeal should suspend the authorised Acts of a Governour, this Doctrine seems to me to be worse than Antichristian, and to put down God.

If God indeed be the Universal Sovereign Lawgiver, and the final Judge; if God be God, and man be man and not above him, to say that we must not obey him before man, and disobey man that commands what he forbids, or that we must not appeal from mans subordinate Law to his supreme Law, nor from mans judgment to his final judgment; and to say, (as

he

be and Thorndike do) that to do so, and practise accordingly, is inconsistent with all Government, are things that I had hoped my ears or eyes should never have seen or heard delivered by a sober Christian. Papists most commonly abhor it, save some few Flatterers of the Pope. If this be so, a man must not only worship Images, swear to the Pope, and do all that Councils command; but also curse Christ if the Turkish Rulers bid him, blaspheme God if Heathen Rulers bid him, and condemn all the Martyrs as Rebels that did subvert all Government, by practising contrary to it and appealing to God. And then man must be every where of the Rulers Religion, and do whatever wickedness he commandeth, Dan. 1. and 3. 6. and the Church for three hundred years and more tell us of other kind of Examples.

V. Mr. D. holdeth this Absolute Destructive Power to be essentially necessary to the Unity of the Catholick Church: which is the sum of Thorndike's Book.

I would not go further from them or the French, in the point of Unity, than I needs must. I shall therefore tell you what is our judgment of it.

1. We grant them, that Christ's Church on earth is one, and its Unity is part of its very essence (as the Unity of the parts of a House, Ship, &c.)

2. We hold that this essential Unity consisteth in the Union of all Christians with Christ, the only unifying Universal Head; and that the Unity described Ephes. 4. 4, 5, 6. sufficeth to it, viz. One Body (of Christ) one Spirit, one Hope (of Grace and Glory) one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one God and Father, &c. And that all this is prescribed in the Gospel, and every true Christian hath all this.

3. That all must endeavour to keep this Unity in the bond of peace, and to be in every lesser matter of one mind, as far as they can: And the Pastors of the Churches to beautifie

beautifie and strengthen the Church, by as much concord as they can well obtain.

4. But that perfect concord being the fruit of personal perfection, will never be had on earth: And the differences of the infirm that cannot be cured, must be tolerated in tender Brotherly Love. And to persecute or destroy Christians, who unite in Christ and the Essentials of Christianity, because they are not of one size of knowledg, and differ in lesser things, is the work of Satan the Enemy of Love, and the great Destroyer.

5. We believe that Synods or Councils are so far good and useful, as they are needful to the foresaid strength and concord of the Churches: But that they are for Agreement, and not for direct Regiment, as Archbishop Usher was wont to say, Councils are not for Government of the severall Bishops by the Majority, but for Consultation and Concord: And they that cannot in all things consent to them in Accidentals, or lesser matters, are not therefore cut off from Christ's Universal Church: But it is a fault peevishly and causelessly to dissent and be singular, a breach of Christ's general Law, of doing our work as much as we can in Love and Concord.

Plainly, Reader, do you know the difference between the Senate of Rome or Venice, and the Assembly at Nimmegen, Ratisbone, or Frankford? The said Senate is una persona Politica, though plures naturales, and hath the Supreme Government by Vote in Legislation and Judgment: and it is Rebellion there to disown their Power, and a Crime not to obey it.

At Nimmegen, Ratisbone, &c. many Princes or their Agents meet for Peace and Christian Concord. It is a sin for any of them to be causelessly against any Vote that is useful to those ends. But no one of them, nor the major Vote, is

b

Gover-

Governour of the rest; nor is any one to be dispossess of his Dominion, that seeth reason to dissent.

This is plain truth; Though Dr. Sherlock find fault with the Learned and Judicious Dr. Barrow, for asserting it in his Treatise against the Papacy.

And it being not Regiment but Concord that is the end of Synods (as over Bishops) there is no more use than possibility of an Universal Council, or one Universal Colledge; But the necessity and aptitude of Councils for strengthening concord, must measure their extent.

What Mr. D's opinion is of the degree of corporal punishment, which he would have used to his ends, I know not: Mr. Thorndike is against Death and Banishment. For my part, the two greatest things that have alienated me from Popery are; 1. That it cheriseth Ignorance, and I am sure that is the soil of all wickedness; God, Christ, the Spirit and Scripture, are Light; and Satan is the Prince of Darkness. 2. That it liveth like the Leech on blood, hating and destroying the most holy persons who differ from them: To these my Soul is unreconcilable. I hate cruelty to Papists or Infidels, much more to godly faithful persons, that do hurt to none.

And I think I have convinced Mr. Dodwell himself, that I am not inclined for the avoiding of Popery, to run into any contrary Extreme; nor to imitate them that ignorantly call Truth, or harmless things, Antichristian or Popish. The name of Popery doth not affright me from any truth of God: What I have written in many Books, especially in the last part of my Catholick Theology, and what censures I have suffered for it, (which never moved me to comply with the Censurers) I think prove it. I again and again profess, That if the Papists, or such as I now deal with, would but prove, that God ever made or allowed such a Church as they plead for in the world, that is an Univer-

Universal Church, constituted or unified by any one Head or Supreme Governing part (Monarchical or Aristocratical) under Christ, the Dispute whether it be Pope, or Council, or Cardinals, or Colledge of Bishops in all the world, shall not hinder me from a chearful and joyfull declaring my self a Papist without partiality, fear or shame, in the sense that the word Papist hath still signified with such as I converse with.

These things I have taken the boldness to ask some of the greatest, that on the forementioned terms appropriate the name of the Church of England to their Sect or Party, and I could get no answer from them, viz. Whether they took the Councils of Constance and Basil for Papists? And whether they now take the Bishops and Church of France for Papists? And whether they took Gerson, Cusanus, Cassander, Erasmus, for Papists, or not?

2. If yea, What is the difference between the said Papists Church-Form and Government, and that which these call the Church Catholick, and Dispute for?

3. If not, Then is not the Controversie de nomine, Whether the French Bishops and Church, and the said Councils being of the same Form and Religion with the Church of England, (as called by these men) ought to be called Papists, or not? And for that I shall strive with none: Let every man call them as he seeth cause; or if he will, as they will call themselves. Let them be Papists in France, and Protestants in England; I contend not for names. But I wonder not at these Church-men, if they unchurch the French Protestants, and condemn their Ministry and Sacraments as none; How else could their Persecution be justified?

And, O that they would tell us, what Churches they be that they live in communion with? Whether the French, Spanish, Italian, Greeks, Nestorians, Jacobites, Copties,
Abissines,

Abassines, be in their Communion, or not? If yea, Whether the Reformed Churches be not as worthy of their communion? If not, whether the Church of England be all the Catholick Church in their account?

O that we could long more for God's righteous final Judgment, (to which we appeal, though Mr. Dodwell be against it) and for the world of perfect Light, and Love, and Union!

Dated Septemb. 2. 1681. (appointed a Publick Fast for the burning of London.)

I have not time to gather the Errata of the Press; I cast my eye on these, Pag. 9. l. 19. for natures, r. names. p. 10. l. antep. dele and. p. 11. l. antep. r. is in. p. 17. l. 1. for or, r. over. p. 5. l. 29. after excommunicating, r. Christ's servants for not forsaking their faithful Pastors. p. 10. l. ulta for of, r. by. p. 16. l. 32. for our r. me. p. 90. l. 12 r. temerity. p. 139. l. 17. for by, r. to. pag. 152 l. 4. for by, r. my, &c.

THE

THE CONTENTS.

A	<i>Late Letter of Mr. Dodwell's, with the Answer, written since the rest was printed.</i>	
Chap. 1.	<i>Of Mr. Dodwell's displeasure against me, as if I accused him to be a Papist, and wronged the Councils of Bishops.</i>	p. 1.
Chap. 2.	<i>His schismatical Church-destroying Scheme, the sum of his great schismatical book confuted.</i>	p. 7
Chap. 3.	<i>The consequents of Mr. Dodwell's foresaid Doctrine.</i>	p. 21
Chap. 4.	<i>My words of Gods Collation of Ministerial Authority vindicated from the forgeries and fallacies of Mr. Dodwell.</i>	p. 27
	<i>What my assertion is of the cause of Church power.</i>	p. 29.
	<i>The contrary, p. 32. The truth proved, p. 33, &c. His objections answered, p. 36. &c. Bishops are of God, p. 46. &c. His sad qualification of Ministers, p. 48. Preferring God is no wrong to Government; p. 54. What succession we have, p. 54. Of Aidan and Finans Episcopacy, p. 57. His assertion of supreme Church-power, from whom there is no appeal to Scripture, to God, or the life to come, and whose intention is the measure of the power of all ordained by them, examined, p. 57, &c. Whether the Church on earth be one visible society under one visible humane Government, p. 59. Whether Divine Authority may not be pretended for practising contrary to some superiors,</i>	p. 60
		Chap.

Chap. 5. *Wherein Mr Dodwell's decoits, and their danger lie.*

p. 63.

Whether there be but one sense of all terms, which causes obliging men to mean, all that have skill in causes are to understand, p. 63.

Twelve great doctrinal Articles in which we differ from Mr. Dodwell, p. 65. *Some questions put to him,* p. 68

His second Letter to me from Ireland, p. 70. *My Answer to it,* p. 75. *proving the impossibility of just Discipline in the Diocesan way, which I dissent from.*

The short Answer to Mr. Dodwell's long Letter (which Dr. Sherlocke and Mr. Morrice extol), which is fully answered in my Treatise of Episcopacy, p. 90.

A Letter sent to Mr. Dodwell Mar. 12. 1681.

A Letter to Mr. Dodwell Nov. 15. 1680.

Anish r to him of July 9. 1677. opening many of our chief differences. p. 100.

Another after a personal conference sent to him, but returned, because he was gone into the Country; debating with him eleven of our great differences: in which Mr. Dodwell may be known. p. 118.

An Account of my dissent from Dr. Sherlocke his Doctrine, Accusations and Argumentation; specially about the essence of the Universal, a National and Single Church, and the nature of Schism, &c.

CHAP. 1. *The Historical Proem.*

CHAP. 2. *My Letter and Counsel to Mr. Sherlocke many years ago, advising him to expound or retract his words, which seem to deny the three Articles of our Baptismal covenant, our belief in God the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost,* p. 162

His Answer,

p. 173

CHAP. 3. *Of the ill manner of these mens Consultations.* p. 174

CHAP. 4. *The main part of our difference, viz. what is the essential form of the Catholick, National and single Churches,* p. 182

Chap.

Chap. 5. *What is the Catholick Church, as described by Arch. Bishop Bramhall, Bishop Gunning, Dr. Saywell, Mr. Thorndike, Mr. Dodwell, Mr. Sherlocke and the French Papists*, p. 193. *Some notes on Dr. Saywell's Communion*, p. 198. *More on Dr. Sherlocke's*. p. 203.

Chap. 6. *What is the Union and necessary Communion of the Catholick Church, according to this accusing Defender?* p. 207. *His unsatisfactory solutions manifested, and Dr. Isaac Barrow's excellent Treatise of Church-Unity, published by Dr. Tillotson, defended against his vain exceptions*.

Chap. 7. *Of the rest of his book*.

p. 228.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
LIBRARY
1215 EAST 58TH STREET
CHICAGO, ILL. 60637
U.S.A.
-The University of Chicago Press
1215 East 58th Street
Chicago, Illinois 60637
U.S.A.
-The University of Chicago Press
1215 East 58th Street
Chicago, Illinois 60637
U.S.A.

*A late Letter from Mr. Dodwell, calling for more Answer,
with the Answer to it, written since the rest was Printed,
though it be here placed.*

Reverend Sir,

I Am now in the Country, and as yet in so unsettled a condition, as obliges me to be a Stranger to new Works. However, by the short view I have when I come into Shops, I find you put me off for a Reply to Mr. *Clarkson's* little Pamphlet concerning Diocesan Jurisdiction: I have got it and perused it, and the design of my writing at present is, to acquaint you with the reason why I think my self unconcerned in it, if that be all I must expect from you in Answer to my yet unanswered Letters. You must excuse me, if I cannot think that Book an Answer, which as it was written before them by your own confession, so neither doth it foresee the accounts given in those Letters, nor provide against them: Whether it do so, let the Reader judge.

But to return to the account intended, why I cannot think my self concerned in this new Pamphlet of Mr. *Clarkson's*, be pleased to understand, that the excellent Dean of St. *Pauls* being engaged against you on the same Argument of my Letters, was pleased to put himself to the trouble of perusing my Papers, as they came from the Press, purposely that he might avoid repeating what had been said by me. This being so, you may easily understand how far I am concerned in what is said to him, when it was indeed wholly distinct from mine. Not that I should have been unwilling to serve that great Person, but that I know he is in much better hands already. Mr. *Clarkson* in this Pamphlet, as he has only mentioned Dr. *Stillingfleets* name, so he hath confined himself to his Arguments, and hath taken notice of nothing in my Letters not considered by the Doctor. If he will be pleased to engage further, I confess I like his temper better than any I have seen of your late Brethren, except Dr. *Owen*. Such an Adversary I should desire, as would confine himself to the Cause, without digressing to personal Slanders. There is one mistake in him,

which you may be pleased to acquaint him with, and that is his translating ~~papers~~ thousands more than once, and sometimes where his Argument is grounded on it, that it may appear to be his mistake rather than the Printers. The mistake is small and separable from the main Cause, but withal is very evident. - But according to his candour in acknowledging it, so I shall see what candour I may expect from him in the main Cause, if he think fit to engage with me in it:

As to your Answers to my Objections against your Ministry in our Oral Debates, had they been unproved Assertions, I should then have thought them sufficiently answered with Denials. But you know the Assertions are proved in the body of my Book; and till I see my Principles unravelled, and Answers more distinctly applied to the junctures, where the proof may seem to fail, I am not likely to see any reason to change my minde. Till you attempt this, I am content the Reader judg, whether what you have done, or shall hereafter do in the like way, deserve the name of a Confutation. If I must never expect any further satisfaction from you for the Slanders you have raised against me, all the return I intend, is my hearty Prayer to God, to qualifie you for your forgiveness, not only of that sin, but of the many others of your late writings, by your re-union to the Church from which you are fallen, on which account alone I have proved that you can expect forgiveness. I am obliged not only on my own account, but to the Publick, to which you have shewn your self an Enemy on this occasion, to reflect on you; but I desire to leave no monuments against you to Posterity. God may yet have mercy on you, and let you see the mischief you are doing, before it be too late. That he will do so, is the most unfeigned request of him, who, notwithstanding your many and great provocations, will still endeavour to approve himself

Shrewsbury,
Sept. 19, 1681.

Yours, as far as is consistent with
his Duty to the Publick,
Henry Dodwell.

When you have occasion to write to me, send your Lettrs to be left with Mr. Took,

Sir,

I Received not yours of *Septemb. 19, 1681. till Octob. 21. through* the miscarriage of one that should have delivered it. *What* you have to say to Mr. *Clarkson*, write to himself and not to me : As to your call for more Answer to your Books, you shall have more. I had wrote one long ago, and cast it by : Men are weary of our Controversies, and had rather all of us gave over. But if I should shew the erreur and impertinency of every such word in your great Book, it might be a years work, when I look not to live so long ; and it might make so great a Volume in Folio, that few I think would buy or read ! And what great good will it do the world, to tell them how grossly you abuse the Church, and how confidently and voluminously you err ?

As to your charge of *Slandering you, and wronging the Church, and being unqualified for forgiveness*, I have the same Accusations from Quakers, Anabaptists, Antinomians and Papists, almost in the same words : Within these two hours an ancient Doctor sent me as hard words [*As being a self-condemned person, to be forsaken, as opposing the Commands of God, and the Faith of Jesus,*] for not yielding to his [*asserting of the Seventh-day-Sabbath, and condemning the Lords-days observation.*] I have these thirty six years lived under such Accusations : It is no new thing for Seducers to use affrighting words instead of proof, and to say, [*Except ye be circumcised and keep the Law of Moses, you cannot be saved.*] It's the cry of most Sects, [*You cannot be saved but in our way*]

Sir, No man living hath more cause to be loath to err, and to be willing to know the Truth. I am as sure, as I can be, if I know any thing of my own minde, that I am not only willing to know the Truth, but to know it at a far dearer rate than it was ever like to cost me in this world. I am sure that I have not been slothful in seeking it : I am sure that I would joyfully recant any Errour that you or any man can convince me of, with hearty thanks for so great a benefit. I have considered your Books; you are confident of my erring and wronging the Church ; and I am as confident of yours : that you are a Misleader of an extraordinary size, that would set up *an Universal humane Supremé Government*, which Protestants have taken for Popery and Treason against Christ ; and who falsly unchurch the Reformed Churches, and deny them all Covenant-right to Salvation, while you told me your self, that *It is not for the Christian Interest to hold, that*

the Roman Bishops Ordination (as you require it) hath had an interfection. Is it a crime to speak truth of you, or a slander to say, 'That the Doctrine of an Humane, Absolute, Universal Sovereignty, is the most Fundamental part of Popery?' And is it no Sin or Slander for you to condemn so many Millions falsely, even the purest and holiest of the Churches on Earth? if not the whole (by self-contradiction?) Is it a damning sin not to feed, cloath, and visit in Prison one of Christ's little ones? And is it a meritorious virtue in Mr. *Dodwell* to unchurch, or unchristen, or degrade, if not condemn to Hell all the Reformed Churches, (nominally but not really excepting *England*?) Yea, and to go about with a persecuting Spirit and Diligence, to provoke Magistrates to lay them in Jayls with Rogues, because they dare not give over Preaching the Gospel, to which they were devoted in their Ordination? Reproaching those Magistrates as Contemners of Religion, who will not punish us as Deceivers, as if it were not you that is the Deceiver? Should I presume to judge, that so many and such men through Christendom, as you condemn, were all so ignorant and so bad, as not to know the common Verities necessary to the essence of the Ministry, and to Salvation, and that 'tis I that can teach it them, by such *media* as Mr. *Dodwell* useth, (while he knoweth that *Vocatus* hath answered a far abler Defender of his Cause) I should sure be reputed a man so extremely proud, as that no complemental humble deportment would excuse.

As for the Question, Whether you are a Papist, what obligation lieth on me to decide it? Why should you expect that I should say you are none? Do you not better know your self? And is not your own word fitter to tell your minde? I do but tell what your Doctrine is.

And I will speak so much plainer than I did, as to say, 'That
 * 1. to hold a humane Universal Church-Supremacy, Aristocratical or Monarchical. 2. And that this Power is so absolute, that there is no Appeal from it to Scripture, or Gods Judgment.
 * 3. And that this Power doth make universal Laws for all the Church by General Councils. 4. And that the Pope hath the Primacy or Presidentship in those Councils ordinarily. 5. And that he is the *Principium Unitatis*. 6. And that it belongs to the President antecedently to call Councils, and to him alone; so that they are but unlawful Routs, or rebellious, if they assemble without his Call. And that they are Schismatics, who dissent

' dissent and disobey this Supremacy. 8. And that the Reformed
 ' Churches, for want of your Episcopal Ordination uninterrupted
 ' from the Apostles times, are no true Churches, have no true Mi-
 ' nistry, or Sacraments, or Covenant-right to Salvation; but by
 ' pretending them, do sin against the Holy Ghost. 9. But that
 ' the Church of *Rome*, by vertue of an uninterrupted Episcopal
 ' Succession, is a true Church, hath a true Ministry, and Sacra-
 ' ments, and Covenant-right to Salvation. 10. And that the
 ' *French* Church (which we call Papists) are safer than the Prote-
 ' stants there. 11. And imply, that the said *French* Clergy,
 ' and the Councils of *Constance* and *Basil* were no Papists. 12. And
 ' that the said Protestants being Schismatics, and sinning against
 ' the Holy Ghost, the Magistrates that will not be Contemners
 ' of Religion, are bound to punish them. (As if in *England* and
France your bellows were needful to blow the fire.) These things
 asserted among you by Bishop *Bramhall*, *Heylin*, Mr. *Thorndike*,
 and you and such others, the Protestants have been hitherto used
 to call *Papery*: But I will not dispute with you a mere question of
 the fitness of the name. If you had rather, call it *Church-Tyranny*,
Cruelty, or *Diabolism*.

And is all this a *Virtue in you*? And is it a sin in me to defend
 Christ's flock, and the true Unity of his Church, and to detect
 such Deceivers, and bear my testimony for Truth, Love and Con-
 cord against such Dividers and Destroyers?

It's a hard case then, that such as I are in, that the more unfeign-
 edly we desire to know God's Will, and the more diligently and
 impartially we study it, and the more it costeth us, the greater
 sinners we are: And no sins have been so loudly charged on me,
 as Praying, and Preaching the Gospel, and laborious vindicating
 God's Truth and Servants. It doth not follow, if you hate them,
 or would have them ruined, that every man sinneth that doth not
 as you do.

And whereas you would get some countenance to your Wri-
 tings, by the name of Dr. *Stillingfleet*, as having perused them,
 &c. Either he is, or is not of your mind? If not, this doth but
 adde to your deceit. If he be, your Cause will do more a-
 gainst the Conscience and Reputation of Dr. *Stillingfleet*, than
 far greater Parts and Reputation than his can do for your
 Cause.

And

And Sir, what should I get, should I give a Voluminous Answer to all your books? When I have confuted you as far as I have done, I have but lost my labour. The Church-men that I hear from, despise it, and say, *What is Mr. Dodwell to us? He is an unordained man (he knoweth why), and his book was rejected by the Bishop of London. His opinions are odd, and the Church of England is not of his mind: Yea, Mr. Cheney would persuade us, that you are a singular contemned fellow.*

But it's a useful way, to set such an one as you to do mens business, and to boast, as Dr. *Sherlocke* and Mr. *Morrice* do, of your performance, and yet to disown you when their cause requireth it. But it is an abuse of us that dissent from you, to *connive only* at your published Books, and then to *boast of them as unanswerable*. And when we have lost our precious time in shewing their deceit and schismatical Love-destroying tendency, then to say to us, *You have done nothing: What is this to us? Mr. Dodwell is an odd disowned man, and none of the English Clergy.*

If God and Conscience would give me leave, I could presently be a good man, and a pardoned sinner with you: It is but honouring you, and saying as you say; I could so be extoll'd by almost any Sect, Papist, Quaker, &c. But it must be but by one: for all the rest would nevertheless revile, accuse me and condemn me, as you do the Protestant Churches. And the Quakers, like you, say, *we sin against the Holy Ghost*. The old Sabatarian Dr. before-named, in his first Letter accused me as a fore-said; and when I profess my self willing to learn of him, as his Disciple, I was in his next, *The unwearied Labourer in Christs harvest, and his marvellous joy*, &c. And in the rest, when I could not receive his reasonings, I became worse and more miserable than ever. It's a wonderful meritorious excellency with such men, to become their Proselytes and admirers.

As true Charity and Piety would vainly propagate Truth, Goodness and happiness; so Pride, Self-conceit, and a Sectarian Spirit, are like the inordinate lust of fornicators, impatient longer than they are propagating their spurious kind.

And indeed the inordinate height of your self-conceitedness and confidence in gross confounding error, will make chaste souls afraid of your procacious solicitations. Had you sought my corporal destruction, and not the Churches ruin, for which you profess a zeal,

I might fitly have let you take your course. But the sober world so well knoweth, that Satan and Papists are so much against the *plain and serious preaching of the Gospel*, and so much for *blood or cruelty towards Dissenters*, how faithful and truly religious soever, that if you go on to be like them, 1. In labouring us to cease preaching. And 2. To call for punishment (we know what) to those that will not cease, you will cherish men in the opinion that you are a Papist, more than all your friends and talk can make them believe that you are not.

Sir, when sin groweth crying and common, I am one that dare not *preach impenitency* by hiding it, and saying, it is a *doubtful or a little thing*, though I expect that guilt should be impatient, and some Doctors should go on to say behind my back, that less than this is unchristian and intemperate passion or abuse.

Methinks you who judg millions of true believers, and lovers of God and holiness, to damnation; and by Printing this, go about to have all men think them such, and consequently to love them no better than the damnable should be loved, should never be so partially tender, as not to endure to be but told what you say and do.

And will you be angry with sober Christians for startling at such a Doctrine, that *All our other qualifications*, though we believe and love God, &c. will not save us, unless we have the Sacrament from a Minister ordained by a Bishop of your described species, and be from such another, &c. to the beginning? Can Christian ears relish the description of such a Hell as containeth the *believing Christian lovers of God and Holiness*, who call'd upon his name, and sought first his Kingdom and Righteousness, and forsook all for Christ, but were damned for want of an uninterrupted Diocesan Ordination of the Priest that gave them the Sacrament, and all his predecessors? Sure Christians hitherto han't believed that Diocesans Sacraments will make a Heaven of wicked ungodly men, nor the want of them make a Hell of Saints.

And will you be angry with me, for not believing that God is such a one, as will for ever hate and damn in Hell the souls that loved him above all? Will he take that love from them when they die? Or do they continue in Hell to love him, while he hateth and tormenteth them? Were not that to call him worse than the Devil, whom they do not love? You only tell us, that they

they cannot be saved for want of your *species* of Sacramenters. But if you meant not by this their *Damnation*, but a *Purgatory* or *Annihilation*, it's meet you should deal plainly, and tell us what it is.

They are Articles of our Faith and Religion, *That whoever believeth* (sincerely) *in Christ, shall not perish, but have everlasting life*: And that *there is joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth*: And *that eye hath not seen, &c. what God hath prepared for them that love him*.

When Dr. *Wilkins* once preached in *Pauls Church* an excellent Sermon for peace and concord, on mutual forbearance, on *Rom. 14. 17. The kingdom of God is not meat and drink. but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost*; For he that in these things serveth Christ, is accepted of God and approved of men, he accosted me at the Pulpit foot with these true words, *I am sure this Sermon pleased you*. If Dr. *Tillotson* will publish that Sermon, as he hath done Dr. *Isaac Barrow's*, those two books will more shame your *love-killing, schismatical doctrine*, than all that I have said against you. And if the fore-mentioned moderating Doctors, go on to publish me to be a man of *unpeaceable provoking language*, for saying, that such *doctrines and practices are great sins*, they will seem to me, to take the preaching of Repentance for reviling, and that he is the sinner that tells men of sin; and that the Laity are far happier men, who may be called to Repentance for their vices, than the Clergy, or Church-corrupters, who are heinously wronged if their sins be named, and they be but intreated to consider and repent; yea, if we but tell the reason, why we dare not do as they, in a time when we have cause to study such Texts as *Ezek. 9. 4*. Perhaps God may permit your principles to get the upper hand. But if he do, I shall love them never the better, but the worse, and shall better love the world which forsake not God, nor is forsaken by him.

Mr.

Mr. DODWEL's LEVIATHAN,
or Absolute Destructive Prelacy, the Son
of ABADDON APOLLTON, and
not of JESUS CHRIST, &c.

William CHAP. I. *Smith Bedford*
March 27

Of Mr. Dodwel's displeasure against me, as if I accused
 him to be a Papist; and accused unjustly the Councils of
 Bishops.

6. T. **W**HEN Mr. Dodwel, in a tedious Vo-
 lume, did null the Reformed Churches,
 their Ministry, Sacraments, and Co-
 venant-title to salvation, meerly for
 want of uninterrupted succession down
 from the Apostles, of Ordination, by
 such as he appropriateth the name of Bishops to, I aggravated
 his fault, as being one that *professeth himself a Protestant*. He
 took this to be an accusation of Popery: I Published, to satisfie
 him, that I meant no such thing; but *de nomine* will call him
 what he calls himself, and *de re* will be no judg of any thing but
 his books and words, to which I leave the Reader to know him:
 This satisfieth him not, but he continueth so much concerned,
 that I doubt he will make men think there is some tender place
 that is so impatient of a mis-supposed touch. I have nothing to
 do with him, or his Religion, as his, further than he assaulteth
 us by his Writings: And he is the Accuser, and the Accusation

B

is

is of no less moment than aforesaid, and sinning against the Holy Ghost, and of Schism, and subverting all Government, if we do but practice differently from the Prelates will, and alledge Scripture and Gods Authority for it, and appeal to Christ. I am but on the Defence against all this.

§. 2. I profess it is not meer education, prejudices, custom, or worldly interest which keep me from Popery, or his way of absolute obedience to Prelates. I have studied what may be said for it as well as against it; and I never met but with Two Objections, which seemed to me worthy of much further search: One was, that seeing *de facto* Popery and high Prelacy have so far and long ruled in the Church, whether it be credible that Christ would so permit it, if he hated it, and give his Church, *de facto*, no better government? 2. Whether mens great proneness to discord, make not Popery (*Italian, or French*) a prudent course.

And to these, 1. I am sure that Christ came to destroy the works of the Devil, and save his people from their sins, and make them holy, *a peculiar people, zealous of good works*, and gather a Church of such out of the world, and rule them in a Communion of Saints, till he bring them to perfection. Therefore I have great reason to suspect those men, and that order and course of government, which cherisheth ignorance and sin in Ministers and People, and hunteth, and silenceth faithful Ministers, and suppresseth, persecuteth, tormenteth, burneth the most conscionable Christians, that for fear of offending God, disobey them, that turn serious Religion and spiriritual Worship of God, into bodily exercises, and meer Conformity to their wills, and outward taking Sacraments, and using commanded Ceremonies and words; under the shadow whereof, for 1000. years, piety hath withered, and impiety prospered.

Christ promised to be with his servants to the end of the world, *Mat 28. 30*. And I cannot but think that he is most with those that are most acquainted with his Gospel, and most love him and obey him, and are most holy and heavenly, and walk not after the flesh, but the spirit, rather than with the ignorant, fleshly, worldly malignant Persecutors, that set them against serious godliness and godly men.

¶ 3. And I take not any notices of the time present from any thing but certain experience; nor of the Ages past, from enemies, or suspected, but of the eldest times from all our common Church-history, and of the last 1000. or 1200. years, as to the worst part of their actions, from their own greatest friends and flatterers, such as *Baronius, Binnius, Platina, Petavium*, and others.

¶ 4. And the matter of fact, I confess, hath had much power on my judgment: Had the Popes, and Lording sort of Diocessans been promoters of love and holiness in the Church, and not the woful scandal of it, and the enemies of good men, and serious piety, I should have been stronger tempted to own their form of government to be of God; though I am assured that Nature maketh *one man*, or *one Council* incapable of proper government over all the earth; I should never have opposed that which doth good. But *destruction, silencing, persecuting, cruelties, rebellions, worldliness, ignorance, malignity*, and *cherishing sin*, and *suppressing piety*, and the very *word of God*, I am sure are all the work of the Devil, what name or titles soever are pretended for them.

¶ 5. And the fact being to me past dispute, I quietly submit to the dreadful providence of God that permitteth it, considering,

1. The Church on Earth is no better than the Angels of Heaven were; and if so many of the Angels kept not their first estate, but fell by *Pride*, what wonder if many Bishops do so?

2. If *Adam* and *Eve* both fell from Innocency, and that so soon, it is not incredible that the Serpent should beguile some Bishops to depart from the simplicity that is in Christ.

3. And if the first born man, *Cain*, murdered his righteous brother by malignant envy for his true Religion, it's no wonder if some Clergy-men are such.

4. And if the whole world so soon was drowned in wickedness, that only *Noah* and his house were meet to be saved from the flood, what wonder if the Church had too great a deluge of iniquity?

5. And to beshoort, if *Noah* himself fall after such deliverance, and a *Cham* be cursed that had been saved, and their posterity proved so bad, that all the *Canaanites*, &c. must be destroyed; if *Sodom's* flames too, better warned *Lot*, or his Wife and Children; if *Abraham* have an *Ismael*, and *Isaac* an *Esau*, and *Jacob* envious Sons, and two Murderers, and two Adulterers; if *Israel* sin, and die in the Wilderness; if *Aaron* after that he had seen, make them an Idol; if *Nadab* and *Abihu* die, as they did; if *Eli's* and *Samuel's* Sons proved all so bad; and in the days of the Judges there were so many revolts and ruinas; if the first King, *Saul*, so soon revolted; if *David* so fell, and *Absolom* so sinned, and *Solomon* himself: If Ten Tribes so quickly broke off from *David's* house, and left him but Two; if those Two proved as bad as the Prophets tell us, and went into Captivity: And if the Nation rebelled against Christ, and be cursed and scattered over the Earth, what wonder if the Pope and proudest Prelate did corrupt the Church of God? If Christ's chosen Twelve had a *Judas* among them; if the rest strove who should be greatest; if *Peter* denied him, and they all forsook him and fled; if Heresies swarmed in the Apostles days, and Jewish Teachers, would have subjected the *Gentiles* to *Moses's* Law; if all forsook *Paul* in his Tryal, and many accused him before, and such as *Diotrephes* cast out the Brethren, and prated maliciously against *John*; if Christ tell us of a little flock, and not many Noble and great are called; if it be as hard for the Rich to be saved as Christ saith; if for Three hundred years the Church was a persecuted people; and if the Patriarchs and Bishops themselves, for many hundred years after accused one another in Councils, and accused such Councils themselves of Heresies, and other crimes, as much as is yet visible they did, why should I be scandalized at the badness of Bishops and Councils, and the woful corruptions of the Church?

Especially considering, 1. That it was chiefly but the worldly proud domineering sort that thus miscarried, as the very Angels did.

2. That God kept up still a great number of humble and holy Bishops and Presbyters, that joined not in usurpations and pride with the rest.

3. And that God blest their labours to the saving of so many Millions of souls, and propagating true serious Religion to this

this day. Yea, some of the great Patriarchs themselves have been holy humble men.

4. And when God preserved, by an humble Ministry, so many Christians, as the *Albigenses*, *Waldenses*, and many among the Papists themselves, from the liking and guilt of the *Roman* corruptions.

5. And when God hath raised so learned, humble, and holy a Ministry to reform the Churches, and blest their labours in *Europe*, and specially in *England*, as he hath done; even those that Mr. *Dodwell* degradeth; yea, many pious Diocesans here and elsewhere, who yet cannot prove their title by his pretended way of successive Canonical Ordinations; nor durst have sworn that they had such a call.

6. I am sure that the work of Christ is the restoring of Gods Image, *holy life*, and *light*, and *love*; and that the destroying of these, by hiding the Scriptures, unintelligible worships, Imagery, dead hypocrisie, silencing, and persecuting, and killing Gods servants, making dividing engines to tear, and Canons to batter the peace of the Church, and this by an ignorant, ungodly, worldly Ministry, seeking not the things of God, but of men; all this is the Devils work; and to do the Devils work against Christ, is not a sign of Christs servants; he bids us judg of our selves and others by the fruits; His servants we are whom we obey: If a *Peter* once give Christ such worldly fleshly counsel, he shall hear worse than I said of Church-Tyrants, *get thee behind me Satan, thou art an offence unto me; for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men, Mat. 16. 22.* hating the good, silencing thousands of faithful Ministers, excommunicating, and sinning against God, in obedience to Prelates, and for using the needful means of their own salvation, and serving God but as *Peter* and *Paul* did; this is the Devils work, if he have any in the world. And Mr. *Dodwell* must trust more to swords than words to keep it up; for there is a spirit in true Christians that will never suffer them to believe that it is pleasing to God, what name soever is pretended for it:

6. 7. I will reverence the *Jews* visible Church, to whom were committed the Oracles of God, but will not say, that they

finned

sinned not in persecuting Christ and his Apostles ; nor say, that they are not now under their own curse, and cut off from the Church, who once cast out Christians from their Synagogues. I will give due honour to Primogeniture, and yet not equal Cain and Abel, Ismael and Isaac, Esau, and Jacob, &c. but expect, that as he that was born after the flesh did persecute him that was born after the Spirit ; even so it will be now : And the world was the world still, when it was taken into the Church. The Heathen Romans were less persecutors than the Jews, and so are the Turks than the Papists.

§ 8. I shall, in due place, take notice of Mr. D's confining the Essence of the Ministry to *transacting between God and man, in covenanting, requiring essentially no more skill than any man is capable of, who is but capable of understanding the common dealings of the world*, p. 73, 74. And that *Immoralities of such mens Lives excuse us not from Schism, for turning from such to better Teachers*, p. 72. contrary to the Epistle of the Carthage-Council, in the case of *Martial and Basilides*, and even of *Ropes and Councils*, that forbid hearing Mals from a Fornicator. And his denying the Scripture to be intended or designed to be a Charter to appeal to for all future generations, and for the extent of Offices, and preventing litigious dispute about government and subjection, p. 80, 81. But that recourse ought now to be had to the intention of the Ordainers for these. And what he saith, p. 81. against appealing to Writings (as he calls them), against the sense of all the visible authority of this life, as unreconcilable to the practice of any visible government on earth, p. 81. And that subjects cannot preserve their subordination to their superiors, if they practice differently, and defend their practices, and pretend Divine Authority for them, where he speaketh indefinitely, and excepteth no practices. And if we may not appeal from man to God and Scripture, we may appeal from Scripture to man. And if mans Law be above Gods, it is not from him ; for the inferior maketh not his superior.

And the root of all this is, p. 82. *That God hath made his Church (and not only particular Churches that are parts of his Church) a visible Society, and constituted a visible Government in it.* Did I know what Mr. D. taketh this *one visible Government* to be, whether General Council, or Pope, or all the Bishops of the world by a major vote,

vote, or all the people of the Christian world, or what, I should know what to say to him. But for this I must not hope.

§. 9. But I shall after speak to his securing subterfuge, p. 90. *That there is but one sense of all terms, which causes oblige men to mean; and that every one ought to know who pretends to skill in causes.* Which I am so defective in, that I know not at all what his cause is till he tell me: Nor know I among many senses of most of his chief terms, which it is that he meaneth. I know not what he meaneth by a *Papist*; and whether he take those for *Papists* that are, as the Councils of *Constance*, and *Basil*, and the *French*, for the supremacy of a Council, the Pope being President, or *Principium Unitatis*, and Patriarch of us in the West. I know not who he meaneth by the Supreme Church-power in the visible Universal Church. I know not by what he essentiateth the very Episcopacy which he so much pleads for; no, nor their Ordination. I know not what he taketh to be the Supreme Church-power over the Church of *England*. And how can I know by the bare general name, when Dr. *Stirlingfleet* denieth any such thing?

CHAP. II.

His Schismatical Church-destroying Scheme Confuted.

§. 1. **B**ECAUSE he dealeth so falsely with my Doctrine, by pretence of putting it into his words and order, I will deal better with him, and deal with his Scheme word by word as he hath laid it down. As for his exceptions, that I refer not his charge of the *sin against the Holy Ghost*, &c. I am not yet so idle, (having formerly written a Treatise of that sin.) His wilful refusal to answer *Voetius de desperata Causa Papalium*, when he knoweth that this Plea is the *Papists* chief strength, and *Jansenius* is so fully answered, is but a dishonourable tergiversation. And it's like he knoweth how *Melancthon* in his Epistles copiously shameth Mr. *Dodwell's* cause as trusted to by the *Papists*; when yet the *Protestants* here plead *Melancthon's* judgment for their Reformation. And though Mr. D. told me, that it is not for the Christian Interest to hold that the Roman suc-

cessive.

cessive Ordination hath been interrupted ; I think they that believe their own most flattering Historians, must believe that the intercession there hath been more notorious, than in those Reformed Churches which Mr. *Dodwell* nulleth, or than those *German* and *Danish* Bishops whom *Bugenbäum* a Presbyterian ordained.

But I will briefly examine the words of his destructive deceiving Frame.

1. That all are obliged to submit to all un-
sinful conditions of the
Episcopal Communion
where they live, if im-
posed by the Ecclesia-
stical Governours
thereof. And,

2. That the nature
of this obligation is
such, as will make them
who rather than they
will submit to such
conditions, either se-
parate themselves, or
suffer themselves to be
excluded from commu-
nion by such Gover-
nours for such a refu-
sal of submission, guilty
of the sin of SCHISM.

Here is Episcopal Communion talkt of,
without telling what is the Episcopacy, or
what the Communion which he means,
and how both are known. Confusion 1.
There are usurping Bishops not truly cal-
led or chosen. 2. There are Heretical Bi-
shops. 3. There may be divers Bishops in
one City or County ; which of these
mean you ? 4. He may be one fit for o-
thers, and not for me, nor am I to take
him for my Pastor. As the *Greek* Bishop
in *London*, and many *Latine* Bishops, that
spake not *English* heretofore ; or his fault-
iness may make it my duty to chuse a
better. 5. What if the King and Law
command the contrary ? 6. All this is no-
thing for submitting to sinful conditions.

2. As it is a duty to refuse sinful con-
ditions, so of many particular Churches
to chuse the fittest for our communion.
The *French*, and *Dutch*, and *Greeks* in
London, are not Schismatics for not
being subject to this Bishop, or locally
communicating with him. 2. You tell
us not how a man shall know he is of
the Bishops communion among a thou-
sand Parish-Churches that differ in many
things, and own the Bishop in some
things, and not in others. 3. Few of the
Diocesis ever locally communicate with
our Bishops ; and mentally the Noncon-
formists communicate in Essentials at
least.

least. 4. Most Christians on earth are guilty of Schism, and yet are not prevalently Schismatics, but still members of the Catholick Church. 5. The Bishops, e. g. in *France*, are more guilty of the Schism than the Protestants. See Dr. *Stillingfleet's* Defence of *Laud*.

Here are two parts.
1. That all are obliged to submit to all un-
sinful conditions of the
Episcopal communion
where they live, if im-
posed by the Ecclesi-
astical Government
thereof.

This proved by these
two degrees.

1. That the suppo-
sition of their being less
secure of salvation out
of this Episcopal com-
munion than in it, is
sufficient to prove them
obliged to submit to all
terms not directly sin-
ful, however unexpedi-
ent, rather than sepa-
rate themselves, or suf-
fer themselves to be ex-
cluded from this com-
munion, chap. 1. §. 7,
8, 9, 10.

1. This is false in the fore-expected ca-
ses: 1. If he be a Bishop to others, and
not to me (unless communion include
not subjection; for so we communicate
with many other Bishops). 2. If the con-
dition imposed be a thing which a Superi-
or Power forbiddeth, (King, or in some
cases Parents.)

The matter and consequences are so
weighty, as tell us it is not well done to a-
buse dull Readers thus with the deceitful
unexplained nature of *Episcopacy*, and
Communion. The love of truth and souls
forbid such deceit. 1. If some receive
only Parish-bishops (of the old sort) and
others also their Archbishops, and o-
thers such Diocesans as put down all Pa-
rish-bishops, which of these have Episco-
pal communion? 2. When of old, many
Ages, Voting, and Fighting, could not
tell men which was the true Bishop among
many competitors, and when at *Rome*
there were oft two or three at once; and
when the worst oft carried the possession;
and Councils themselves were for divers;
which was the Episcopal communion?
3. Is communion and subjection all one with
him, or divers? If divers, I have com-
munion with many Bishops that I am not
subject to. If the same, how many must
each man be subject to? and in what or-
der and cases? 4. *Communion* is 1. mental
or local; and the first, 1. In essentials.
2. In-

2. That there is in-
deed less security of

salvation to be had e-
ven on performance of
the Moral conditions
of salvation, out of this
Episcopal communion,
than in it.

This proved from two
things.

1. That they cannot
be so well assured of
their salvation in the
use of extraordinary as
of ordinary means; nay
that they being left to
extraordinaries, is a
condition either very
hazardous, or at least
very uncomfortable at
present, whatever it
may prove hereafter,
Ch. II.

2. Integrals. 3. Accidents of Christiani-
ty. Have communion with all Christians
in Essentials, with the best in most inte-
grals; with none in all, nor in all acci-
dents. 4. I am more secure in the mental
communion of many Bishops, than of
some one, and of All in Essentials, and
certain things, than of some one in sus-
pected things, especially in universal com-
munion with Christ and his whole
Church.

2. He that hath no communion with
any true Bishops of Gods institution, in
his judgment, will, and profession, hath
no communion with Christs Church:
But if they are, 1. of a false species, 2. in-
capable, 3. unordained; 4. obtruders not
consented to by the Clergy and the
Flock, it's safest to disown them. 5. And
if they turn wolves, thorns, and thistles,
or hereticks.

2. It's dangerous to refuse communion
with the true *Episcopi Gregis*, but not
with such as depose them. 3. And its
doubtful as to the *Episcopi Episcoporum*.

1. It's but deceit to distinguish only
ordinary and *extraordinary*, in speaking of
the necessity of means. The Gospel writ-
ten or preached, is an *ordinary means*,
which to want is *hazardous* indeed; so
is meditation, prayer, and sacraments,
where they may well be had, and Pastors
to administer them. But there are many
lesser means that may be wanting or ig-
norantly refused, where salvation is safe.
The Church of *England* thinks preaching
to be such, which forbiddeth men to go
for Preaching, and from a bare Reader in
his own Parish. And the *Indians* convert-
ed by *Erumentum* and *Edecius*, might have
certain

2. That these ordinary means of salvation are, in respect of every particular person, confined to the Episcopal communion of the place he lives in, as long as he lives in it.

certain salvation before they had any Pastor. And so may they that cannot know among contenders which is the true Pastor either as to the *species* or individual.

But 2. Communion in every lawful thing is no ordinary requisite means of salvation.

Mark Reader that he said, *that suffer themselves to be excluded from Communion by such Governours, for refusing submission to un sinful things.* And Dr. Saywell, Bishop Gunnings Chaplain, and this man, make such refusal and schism damnable. Now mark here, how they make all indifferent imposed things consequently necessary to salvation, and make all such indifferences to be Articles of faith, or necessary to salvation to be believed. *E.g.* if Organs, the Cross in Baptism, Surplices, Church-images, Exorcisms, and five hundred such, be indifferent, and commanded by the Bishop, he that is excommunicated for not conforming to them, or withdraweth for it, is a damnable Schismatick: *Ergo*, it is necessary to salvation to conform to every one of them in that case: *Ergo*, it's necessary to salvation to hold them to be lawful (or else to use them while I verily take them to be sins). To what a mass now have these men brought the Articles or necessities to salvation! Doth any living man know all lawful things to be such?

This proved from Two things. •

1. That these ordinary means of salvation are confined to the external Communion of the visible Church.

1. Then in *Abassim*, where there is but one *Abuna* Bishop, local Communion with him is impossible to most. 2. And how is the Patriarch of *Alexandria*, who ordaineth him of that Place that is another Kingdom. 2. Then in one Place-Communion with *Papists*, in another with

Greeks, Moscovites, Abissines, Armenians &c. is necessary in *unfinsful things*. 3. Who will judg, but the Excommunicator, what is *unfinsful as to his act*? 4. What a case were men in at *Rome*, under *Formosus* *Stephen*, *Sergius*, *Eugenius* 4. *John* 12. and 22. &c. and at *Alexandria* under *Peter*, *Meletius*, *Paulinus*, *Flavianus*, and so oft in other Schisms, and Nullities? 5. The *Novatians*, and *Joannites* had the ordinary means of salvation in *Constantinople*, under separate Pastors.

But it's true, that the ordinary means are confined to the visible Church, and its external Communion where it may be had. Of which more anon.

This proved from Four things.

1. We cannot be assured that God will do for us what is necessary for our salvation on his part, other wise than by his exprefs promises that he will do it, *Chap.* III. §. 1, 2.

2. The ordinary means how we may assure our selves of our interest in his promises, is by our interest in his Covenant, by which they are conveyed to us, *Chap.* III. from §. 5. to the end.

3. The ordinary means by which we may assure our selves

1. Some think that if God had only commanded men to love him, call upon him, hate sin, seek life eternal, without an *exprefs promise*, one might be sure it should not be done in vain.

2. But God hath expressly promised salvation to all that truly love, trust, and obey him, and seek first Gods Kingdom, and are pure in heart, holy, and love all men, though they were excommunicate for not crossing, subscribing, or thinking *Diocesans* unlawful.

Chap. 3. The *Promises* of God, and his *Covenant*, on his part, are all one. Those that God promiseth to save, shall certainly be saved: who those are, the Gospel fully tells us, yea, and told men before the particular Churches were fixed under their proper Pastors, called Elders and Bishops in the Scripture.

3. *Transaction* is an ambiguous word.

1. It was transacted by making the promise by Christ on Earth. 2. It is transacted

of our interest in this Covenant with him, is by our partaking in these external solemnities, by which this Covenant is transacted and maintained, *Chap. IV, V, VI, VII.*

4. The participation in these external solemnities, with any legal validity, is only to be had in the external Communion of the visible Church, *Chap. VIII.*

B. (II.) That this visible Church, to whose external Communion these ordinary means of salvation are confined, is no other than the Episcopal Communion of the place where

acted by giving the consenting penitent Believer a Right, before God, to Christ and salvation, when he first truly so consenteth. 3. It is transacted by a solemn Ministerial Investiture, sealing and delivering that Right for the fuller comfort of the consenter, and *in foro Ecclesie*, to give the Right of external Communion, as a Tessera, when the person is baptized. 4. It is transacted by renewed confirmation, and for further grace, daily in the Eucharist. I love not to offend you; but I must be true to truth and souls, and therefore tell men, that these Generals and Confusions are but Cheats.

3. Would you have men believe that *external solemnities* are necessary to the Right of Heart-Covenanters before God, as to salvation? Or that all *external solemnities* are of the same necessity? The Church of England takes *Confirmation* to be an external solemnity, for assuring men of Gods favour, by the sign of Imposition of a *Diocesans* hands; and yet bind you to profess that it is not necessary to salvation, but the baptized Infants are *certainly and undoubtedly saved* without it. Litanies, Processions, and many *external solemnities* are not essential to external Communion with the visible Church.

Chap. 8 O tremendous! Is it no other? Is not the universal visible Church, consisting of all professed Christians, *Headed* only by Christ, the only universal Church visible in the world? Is there no Communion with this as such? Had the baptized Eunuch (by Philip the *Evangelist*.) no Communion with the

any one lives, whilst he lives there.

This proved in Two parts.

(1.) That the visible Church, to whose external Communion these ordinary means of salvation are confined, is the Episcopal Communion.

This proved by these degrees.

(A.) 1. That salvation is not ordinarily to be expected without an external participation of the Sacraments.

the visible Church, nor promise of salvation; nor the *Iberians*, *Indians*, and many others that were baptized before they knew, or had a Bishop? Do not baptizing Presbyters (and Lay-men say, *Tertullian* and the Papists) assure men of salvation, though they should not hear of a Bishop? Why was not Diocesan Episcopacy in the Creed, if the belief and obedience be necessary to salvation?

a (1.) 1. Apostles and Evangelists took men into the visible Communion of the universal Church, before they had particular Church-Bishops: 2. Fixed Church-Communion was exercised universally under Congregational, or Parochial Bishops or Pastors, without such as our Diocesans. It must be Pastoral, or true Episcopal regular Communion. 3. Many Individual Bishops, separating from one another, have been, and may be in one City. 4. If e. g. the Bishop of *Lincoln*, have many Counties, and one differing from him, were chosen by the Clergy at *Leicester*, *Hartford*, &c. as he was by the King, which of them is the Bishop on the place? If *Gloucester* Clergy and People had chose another when *Goodman*, a Papist, was Bishop, which was the Bishop?

1. 1. Salvation is pronounced by Conformists to be certain upon Baptism, without any other Sacrament. 2. Popes and Papists are as much as any for tying salvation to Sacraments; and yet a Pope *Victor* and his Council, at *Benevent*, 1078. decree, that rather than Communicate with a *Simonist*, they should persist without visible Communion, and in mind joined

ed to Christ, have his Communion.
 3. What shall they do *ordinarily* in Italy, Spain, France, &c. that have none but Papiſt Biſhops.

1. *Negatively*, Not by thoſe other popular means, which ordinary perſons are apt to truſt in, to the neglect of the Sacraments; that is,

1. Not by hearing the Word Preached, Chap. IX.

2. Not by private Prayer, nor indeed by any out of the Communion of the Church, Chap. X, XI, XII, XIII, XIV.

2. *Positively*, That ſalvation is ordinarily to be expected only by this external participation of the Sacraments.

1. Proved concerning Baptiſm, Chap. XV.

1. Wiſful neglect of any known means, ſheweth wiſful diſobedience againſt God. But many means may be ignorantly neglected without deſtroying aſſurance of ſalvation. *Tertullian* thought children ſhould ſtay from Baptiſm, unleſs in danger of death: and *Nazianzen* was for ſome years delay. This ignorance damned not the practiſers. Apocryphal books, divers Sacraments, Ceremonies, Church-Offices, Doctrines, have been controverted means among true Chriſtians. 2. *Faith comes by hearing*, Rom. 10. Chriſt bleſſeth them that hear and do it: Thouſands are mentioned as believing by hearing, and ſalvation is promiſed to Faith.

2. 1. *Whoever ſhall call on the name of the Lord, ſhall be ſaved: Ask and ye ſhall have*. True faith and converſion, wrought by hearing God's word, and working by true love and prayer, hath many a promiſe of pardon and ſalvation. 2. Is a baptized praying believer out of the Communion of Chriſts Church, though he doubt of Dioceſans, or Patriarchs? He is not.

2. 1. Ordinarily faith comes by hearing, and hearing by preaching; and he that truly believeth ſhall be ſaved, *John* 13. 16. 2. I think many Score, or Hundreds of Proteſtant Divines have proved that Baptiſm giveth not the firſt Right to life, but only ſolemnly confirmeth, ſealet, and by Miniſterial inveſtiture publicly delivereth that which true

Faith

Faith received before. See *Gataker's two Tracts* on Dr. *Ward's* and Dr. *Davenant's Theſes*. 3. What's Baptiſm to Epiſcopacy; till King *James* alter'd it, Women might Baptize in *England*, and Priests ſtill may. And are men Baptized into the *Name*, or *Belief* of *Diocelans* (as *Bellarmino* ſaith, Baptiſm binds them to the Pope). Prove this if you can.

2. Concerning the Lords Supper, *Chap. XVI, XVII.*

2. If Baptiſm undoubtedly ſave, at what Age doth the effect ceaſe? 2. The Lords Supper is neceſſary for corroboration, and for expreſſing true obedience, and living by Faith on Chriſt, where it can lawfully be had, and the need and uſe of it is underſtood.

II. That the validity of the Sacraments depends on the Authority of the perſons by whom they are adminiſtered, *Chap. XVIII.*

(B.) This is falſe: If they be given by a Lay-man, falſly pretending Orders, or by one who hath no Authority through uncapacity, or uſurpation; yet the receiver loſeth not his Right; he taketh it as from God: and if his ignorance be not culpable, there is not ſo much as diſobedience in it. 2. If I prove that Papiſts have no ſuch Authority as you plead for, are all their Baptiſms and Ordinations null?

III. No other Miniſters have the Authority of Adminiſtring the Sacraments, but only they who receive their Orders in Epiſcopal Communion.

III. *Epiſcopal Communion* is the *Coturnu*, the Hoſe drawn over your ulcer and ſnare. 1. We have mental Communion, in Eſſentials, with all true Biſhops in the world. 2. We have Subject Communion with true Pariſh-Biſhops. 3. And with their Ruling Biſhops, at leaſt as Magiſtrates. 4. *Novatians, Luciferians, Donatiſts*, and others, in time of Schiſms, had all Orders in Epiſcopal Communion, and ſo have *Papiſts, Greeks, Moſcovites, Armenians*. 5. Pariſh-Biſhops have more proof of Authority from

from Christ than the Bishops, or many hundred Congregations that have no other Bishops. 6. Authority may be given by God, without any Ordination, where it cannot be had; or not without sinning.

This proved by Four degrees.

1. That the Authority of Administ'ring the Sacraments must be derived from God, Chap. XIX.

2. That though it be derived from God, yet it is not so derived without the mediation of those men to whom it was at first committed, Chap. XX.

3. That it cannot be so derived from those men to whom it was first committed, without a continued succession of persons, orderly receiving Authority

1. No doubt but all true Authority must be derived from God.

2. Those to whom it was first given, were the Twelve Apostles. They are considered, 1. As the Inspired Propheticall Declarers and Recorders of the Laws, and Doctrine, and Promises of Christ. 2. As chief Pastors of the Church, to gather and rule it. All Gods gifts and graces that come to us by the mediation of the Gospel, come by the Apostles mediation in the first sense, as declaring Christs Will, how Ministers shall be made in all Ages. And as chief Pastors, gathering, and settling the first Churches, which, by Christs Charter, shall call their Pastors, and so others, to the end of the world; they may be said to be *Mediators* herein.

3. But they mediate not as the Donors of the Pastoral power, as being Pastors themselves, but only as Ministerial Investors. The Sacraments come not to us without the mediation of the Apostles, but they made them not, nor make them effectual, nor make new Apostles to deliver them.

3. This is deceitful confusion. 1. Authority to Administer Sacraments, and Authority to call others to administer them, are different things. 2. And so is succession of Apostolical power, and succession of common Ministry. 3. And so is giving power, as the Donor, and giving

from those who had Authority to give it them from those first times of the Apostles to ours at present, *Chap. XXI.*

4. That this Authority is not now to be expected any where but in the Episcopal Communion, *Chap. XXII, XXIII, XXIV, XXV.*

giving it as an investing servant. 4. And *proper giving it*, and *improper*, which is but *qualifying* the persons to *receive it*.

1. Apostolical Prophetical conveyance hath no such succession. 2. The Flock that have no Authority to Administer Sacraments, partake of the Authority to call others to do it. 3. Inferiors may have Authority to call Superiors (else the highest could not be made). 4. None of these people give the power, but their Election is part of the receivers qualifications, to whom God giveth it by his Law or Charter; And then as servants, they solemnize the Investiture. 5. The power of this Law or Charter is never interrupted: But if all Pastors were dead an Hundred years, it would renew Pastoral power in the Church, without uninterrupted Donors or Investors.

4. This conveying power is where-ever Gods Law, and capable receivers are: A capable receiver is, 1. One personally qualified with sufficiency and willingness. 2. And that hath the Churches and Ordainers necessary consent, when ordinary for order sake, the Ordainers then must invest him by declaring him authorized by God, &c.

The regular Ordination (like publick Matrimony after contract) is to be by authorized Ordainers; and most Bishops, *Diocesan, Papists, Greeks, Moscovites, Armenian, &c.* are of more doubtful Authority than Congregational, or Parish Bishops, though the former usurp the name, as appropriated to them.

b. 2. 1. Then

b. (2.) That the Episcopal Communion, to which every particular person is obliged to joyn himself, as he would enjoy the ordinary means of his own particular salvation, is the Episcopal Communion of the place wherein he lives, whilst he lives in it, *Chap. XXVI.*

b. 2. 1. Then men in *Rome, Italy, Spain, France, &c.* must be of the Papists Prelates Churches and Communion. 2. *Paulinus* and *Flavian*, *Donatists*, *Novatians*, *Arrians*, &c. may have Bishops in the same place. And the Orthodox, two, or more at once: *Grotius* thought as many as there were Synagogues in a City. 3. Then if I prove the chief Pastor of a Parish, or City-Church, to be a true Bishop by virtue of Gods Law; and if he have better Qualification, and Election, and Ordination, to be of surer Authority than the Diocesan, it's his Communion that we must prefer. 4. But indeed Baptism and Salvation are ordinarily given before Episcopal Communion of any sort. 5. They that thought the Pope Antichrist (as most Protestant Bishops long did), thought it a duty to reject the Communion of the Bishops of the places where they lived: And *Denmark*, and other Countries set up others against them that were ordained by *Bugenhagius*, and other Presbyters. 6. Parochial and Diocesan bounds are humane mutable institutions. 7. If the Bishop of the place be a Schismatick, the Communion of a better near is better.

b. II. That the nature of this obligation to un sinful conditions of their Episcopal Communion, is such as will make them guilty of the sin of SCHISM, who rather than they will submit to such Condi-

b. II. 1. All causeless separation from any Christians, or causeless disobedience to any Pastor, or neglect of any Christian duty, needful to the Churches peace and concord, and every opinion and practice that is against them, doth make a man guilty of sinful Division, or Schism in some degree. And while every Christian hath many errors and sins,

tions, either separate themselves, or suffer themselves to be excluded from Communion by their respective Diocesan Ordinaries, Chap. XXVII.

sins, which all tend to some sinful breach (as the least fore is *solutio continui*), I cannot see but every man living hath some guilt of Schism; nor that there is any Church on earth that hath not some such guilt: But every degree of guilt denominateth not the man, or Church a Schismatick, in a predominant or mortal sense. And in Charity, I hope that even some of those heinous Schismaticks may be saved, that divide the Churches by their usurpation, obstruction, sinful impositions, and worldly domination; yea, some that in blind zeal put down Parish-Bishops, and smite and silence the Pastors, and scatter the Flocks. And if I must have Communion with none that's guilty of Schism, with what Church or Bishop should I joyn? And if their Sacraments be invalid, what a case is *Italy, Spain, France*, yea and *England* in? Must all be baptized again that they baptized?

2. But it's no schism but a duty for the people as far to forsake a sinful Bishop (much more an usurper) as *Cyprian* and that Council advised them to do in the case of *Marcell* and *Basilides*.

3. And after all this deceitful confusion, note Reader, that he denieth not our disobedience to be lawful in case of *sinful conditions imposed*. And if we fully prove not this to be our case, let our accusers silence us, and let our guilt be our shame.

4. And if people that had Parish-Bishops on the place where they lived, lawfully called, shall forsake them to obey a Diocesan that is not on the place, but

p.rhaps

perhaps Forty, or Fifty, or Sixty Miles off, and never saw them, and was obtruded contrary to the ancient Canons, which nullifie such, and sets himself to silence faithful Pastors, and persecute them, and other godly Christians, for not sinning heinously upon deliberate choice and covenant, doth not even this man conclude such to be Schismaticks that are out of the ordinary way and hope of salvation.

CHAP. III.

The consequence of Mr. Dodwell's foresaid doctrine.

1. **T**HOSE that live under the Popish Bishops in *Italy, Spain, France, &c.* must live in their communion, and under their command in all un sinful things.

2. The Protestant Churches that have not Episcopal Ordination, are no true Churches, and have no true Ministers or Sacraments, nor any Covenant-right to salvation.

3. The Protestant Churches are in the same unchurched damnable case that have Bishops, if they have not an uninterrupted succession of such from the Apostles canonically ordained.

4. Therefore the Churches of *Denmark, Germany, &c.* that have Superintendents ordained at the Reformation by *Bugenbaggus, Pomeranus* a Presbyter, and all the rest whose succession was interrupted, are in the same case.

5. It is Schism, and rejecting Sacraments, and Covenant-right to salvation, in all the people that continue in such Protestant Churches, and communicate with them.

6. It is better for the Protestants in *France* to joyn with the Papists, than to live as they do without Sacraments or Church-communion.

7. Yet (by self contradiction) it will follow, that certainly the Church of *Rome*, and all that derive their ordination from that Church,

Church, have no true Bishops, Ministers, Sacraments, Churches nor Covenant-right to salvation; for it's certain their true succession hath been oft interrupted, 1. By such utterly uncapable persons as all History describeth, and even *Baronius* calleth *Apostolicos non Apostolicos*; and such as divers General Councils judged Hereticks, Infidels, Simoniaks, &c. e. g. *Engenius 4.* who yet kept in. 2. By such whose false ordination the Canons expressely null. 3. By many Schisms, two or three Popes at once, of whom none can tell who had the right, or whether any. 4. By the Popes taking on him to be Christs Universal Vicar, an Office in *specie* usurpt, which he maketh his Episcopacy, and as such giveth his orders. And all his Presbyters have turned the true Ministry into the false one of Mass-Priests; and being no true Ministers, can give no true Sacraments by his rule.

8. Yea it is certain, that few, if any Churches on earth, can prove such an uninterrupted succession as he and the *Papists* describe, and most its known have no such thing.

9. Therefore if any have such a succession, they cannot know it, it being a thing that cannot be proved; and so cannot be sure that they are true Churches, &c.

10. For the certainty of any true Ministry, Church, Sacraments and Salvation, dependeth on such knowledg of History as is not in the world: *viz.* To know that this Bishop and his Ordainer, and his Ordainer, and his Ordainer, and so up to the Apostles, were every one true Bishops, and truly Ordained; which no mortal man can know.

11. Men that by a Prince, against even the Nullifying Canons, can but get possession of Patriarchal and Diocesan Churches, without the Clergy or peoples choice, have thereby the power of damning men that fear God, at their pleasure. For, 1. they must pass for the Bishops of the place. 2. They may command any *unjust thing*, and excommunicate him that doth not obey. 3. He is a Schismatick that *suffers* himself so to be Excommunicate, and so is in a damnable state. 4. He cannot hinder it, not knowing the thing to be *unjust*.

12. For by this whoever will escape damnable schism, must be one that knoweth the *unjustness* (as he speaks) of all things in the world that are such, which a Prelate may command; or else he must do any thing which he judgeth sin, if a Prelate command it. But that is wicked Idolizing man.

13. And

13. And therefore by this rule, no man living can be saved that a Prelate hath a mind to damn ; or from his damning impositions. For no man living knoweth the lawfulness of all lawful things, and therefore may take a commanded thing for sin that is not : and then if he wilfully do that which he judgeth sin, he rebelleth against God ; if he do it not, the Prelate may excommunicate him, and irresistibly make him a damnable schismatick.

14. And hereby there are as many hundred new Articles of Faith made, as there are things lawful which a Prelate will command. For though all is not to be done that is to be believed, yet all must be *believed* to be lawful and duty which must be done as such : e. g. We cannot love God, worship him, hear and read his Word, &c. as by Divine obedience, unless we believe it to be our duty by a Divine command. Therefore when as Mr. *Dodwell*, Dr. *Saywell*, and such others tell us what damning schism it is to disobey such commands of the Bishops, or to suffer our selves to be Excommunicate, it plainly includeth that it is as damning a sin to take any lawful thing to be a sin, and not to believe it to be lawful whatever the Bishop shall command. And so to how many hundred indifferent things may the Articles of our Faith be extended, while it is made ordinarily necessary to Salvation to do them, and therefore to believe them to be lawful?

15. By this he confoundeth *Communion* and *Obedience* : I may have communion with many Bishops whom I am not bound to obey : But I cannot hinder them from Excommunicating me without obeying them.

16. Yea, he maketh Communion and Salvation to lye not only on such obedience, but on such *perfection* of obedience as reacheth to every lawful indifferent thing. Whereas God himself under the Gospel accepteth of sincerity, instead of perfection which the Law required of perfect man.

17. This is the way to make Bishops absolute Lords of Kings and States, and all the world, if they can make them believe that on pain of damnation for schism, all must obey them even in every indifferent thing.

18. If you would ferret him out of his Burrough, ask Mr. *Dodwell*, what if the Bishop of the place where I live contradict the Archbishop, or the Synod, or most of the Bishops in the land, which must I obey to escape damning schism ? Doubtless he will allow me to disobey my Bishop. But what if the National Synod

gain.

gainſay the Provincial? He will ſay, I may diſobey the Provincial? But what if a Council of many Nations, called General, gainſay the National? and it be known that our National Church is gainſayed by the far greateſt part of the Biſhops in the world? which muſt I obey? If the National, why not a Provincial againſt them? And why are not they Schiſmaticks for diſobeying a General Council? If it be the greater Council that I muſt obey,

1. What's become then of his doctrine of obeying the *Episcopacy* of the place where we live?
2. And then we are brought under a foreign Jurisdiction.
3. And who but the Pope muſt call that General Council, preſide, approve, &c.?
4. And among all the erroneous and contradicting Councils called *General*, how ſhall all Chriſtians know which of them to obey? We ſee whither all will come at laſt. But ſaith Biſhop *Biſon*, *To ſuch Councils called General, we owe reſpect for concord, if they abuſe us not by error or uſurpation; but ſubjection and obedience we owe them none.*

19. How hardly will theſe men ever reſolve one's conſcience which is to be taken for the *Episcopacy* of the place, when there are in the ſame place both different ſpecies of Biſhops, and alſo divers Biſhops of the ſame ſpecies, and all pretending to be right. In *Ireland* both the *Papiſt* and *Proteſtant* Biſhops pretend to juſt ſucceſſion; and ſo they did in *Bohemia*, *Poland*, *Transylvania*, *Hungary*, &c. And doth ſalvation lye on mens knowledg who hath right?

20. And how contrary is it to the way of Chriſt, and the ancient Church (that made the Baptiſmal covenant the terms of ſalvation) for men to make it neceſſary for every poor man and woman that will have Covenant-right to ſalvation, and eſcape damning ſchiſm, to be able to decide the controversies between all ſuch pretenders, and to know whether their Biſhops be of a true ſpecies, and have true Ordination, and to be ſuch rare Hiſtorians as to know that all the line of Ordainers down from the Apoſtles to their Biſhops, were truly ordained? O difficult terms!

21. Doth he not condemn all thoſe Ancient and Modern Chriſtians as Fautors of damning Doctrine, who thought that when there were none of the Clergy to do it, lay-men might baptize and give the Lords Supper? *Grotius* told us his judgment for it in *Difſertat. de Cena adminiſtrar. ubi Paſtores non ſunt*: And he hath vindicated *Tertullian's* judgment for it, confeſſed by *Riſulian*. *Anſon*. *Govea* tells us it was the caſe of the Chriſtians of *Malabar*,

Malabar, &c. called of *St. Thomas*, whose Bishops being all destroyed, they caused a Deacon to administer the Eucharist, as the Bishops and Presbyters had done (which *Grotius* also repeateth). *Jonan. Antiochenus* magnified by *Socrates*, lib. 6. cap. 3. when at *Antioch* there were two Churches, with two Bishops, *Meletius* and *Paulinus*, stuck to *Meletius* till he died, and after, for three years, would communicate with neither. Did he by this become a damned Schismatick, or lose his Covenant-right to salvation?

22. Many of old were chosen for Bishops before they were baptized (the cases of *Ambrose*, *Nectarius*, *Synesius*, &c. are known): If the Church thought them all to be in a state of damnation, for want of the Sacrament, it's strange that they would choose them to be their Bishops (though it was irregular).

Indeed it's true that *Grotius* saith (*ibid.* in fine), that *Chrysostomes*, *Nazianzenes*, and others cases tell us, that it was ordinary in the Greek-Church to delay baptizing even the children of the faithful, till at full years (about Twenty). Were they all that while without any promise of salvation, or ordinary hope?

23. What a task will it be for Mr. *Dodwell* to tell us what state the baptized are in till they receive the Lords Supper? Baptism saveth them once; but yet till they receive the Lords Supper by a Minister, in successive Episcopal Orders, they have no Covenant-title to salvation, by his way. But some Communicate not till Thirty years old, some not till One and Twenty, and in *England* scarce any before Sixteen. Are they all this while the children of God, or of the Devil? And when is it that their Christianity ceaseth for want of the other Sacrament? I believe that if they truly believe, they are Gods children before they come to the second Sacrament (or the third, as some call it.) Was *Constantine Mag.* in a state of damnation, who was not baptized till near his death? Or the good Emperour, *Valentinian*, who died unbaptized, but taken by *Ambrose* for a blessed man? What absurdities are men fain to use, to get the Mastery of the Christian world, by making men believe that they can save or damn them by the power of Sacraments?

William Smith. March 27 1790

24. And how is this man for Conformity; by which they subscribe assent to the certain salvation of Infants, so dying without Confirmation; and ordain that the Lords Supper be not Administred to any till they are ready to be Confirmed, by learning the Catechism, and recognizing the Covenant? &c.

25. Doth he not make the chief Bishops and Reformers of the Church of *England*, to be the promoters of the Doctrine which he accounteth so damnable, when Dr. *Stillingfleet* in his *Irenicon* recites the words of *Cranmer*, and others of them, at a Consultation, down-right against not only the necessity of his uninterrupted succession, but also even of Episcopal Ordination it self? And I have elsewhere cited about Fourteen of them, for the validity of Ordination without Bishops: And Dr. *Stillingfleet*, Bishop *Edw. Reynolds*, and many more, held that no Form of Government was of Divine determination. Did all these plead for damning Schism, against all title to salvation?

26. And what could more directly contradict the main tenor of the Gospel, which tells us of the saving power of the Word Preached, how it converteth souls, and promiseth salvation to all that truly believe and repent? Inasmuch that *Paul* thanks God that he baptized few of the *Corinthians*, because God sent him not to baptize, but to Preach the Gospel?

27. But his Doctrine feigneth, that God will damn them that truly believe, repent, love God, forsake sin, for want of the Sacrament: or else that the Word converteth none, but only Sacraments convert men.

28. And then it will follow, that none but unbelievers; impenitent wicked men should be first admitted to the Sacrament; for if that only converteth, then it is only the unconverted that must first be received to it.

29. When all's done, he doth but contradict his end; for it's hard to find a National Episcopacy on earth, which imposeth no unlawful thing on Ministers or people: And with all such he speaketh not for our Communion.

30. Either Ordination, and Collation of Church-power, must be given by Superiors, or by Equals: if by Equals, why may not Presbyters make Presbyters? If by Superiors, then who shall give the Pope his Power? Or if you think any other be the highest, who makes them such? Who giveth the Archbishop of *Canterbury* his Power?

31. In short, as far as I can understand, these men deny all Covenant-right to salvation to all men living, and all true Sacraments and Church-Communion, or at least, all knowledg of any such thing; seeing, as it is certain, that in most Churches such Ordination as they describe, hath not had an uninterrupted succession, so no man is sure that any one Church or man hath had such. And they that silence us for not subscribing, declaring and swearing obedience to our Diocelans, and other Ordinaries, are bold men, if they dare swear themselves, that they are true Bishops, and have any Authority to rule and command us, by an uninterrupted succession of a Canonical Episcopal Ordination down from the Apostles.

But I have already in my Book of Concord, Part. 3. Chap. 9. opened so many palpable, and pernicious absurdities, and ill consequences of Mr. *Dodwell's* Doctrine, which he dare not undertake to answer, but silyly passeth by, that I must expect the Reader will there peruse them, who will judg uprightly between him and me; and therefore will hear what both have said. And those that will judg falsly upon partial trust, to save themselves the labour of tryal, are out of the reach of ordinary means to be saved from deceivers.

CHAP. IV.

My words of Gods Collation of Ministerial Authority, Vindicated from the forgeries and fallacies of Mr. Dodwell.

§. 1. CHRIST hath taught me to judg of Prophets, or Teachers, by their *fruits* more than by their *cloathing*, *Mat. 7.* And the fruits which are of God, are those which express the Divine Nature and Image, viz. holy Light and Truth, holy Love, and holy Life and *Prædication*, and the promoting of these in the world.

And Christ hath taught me, that the Devil is, 1. Against holy Light and Truth, the Prince of Darkness, and a Liar, and the Father of Lyes. 2. Against holy Love, accusing, slandering, and

and reading as odious the servants and ways of Christ. 3. Against holy, righteous, and sober living; and an opposer of it, and a persecutor and murderer of the Saints.

And those that are likest Satan in these three parts of his Image, and whose works are more certainly the works of these three Diabolical Principles, I am taught by Christ to judge of by their fruits. So much as there is in Mr. *Dadwell's* labours, of holy Truth, holy Love, and helps to holy living, so much sure is of God. But so much as there is in his, or any of his Parties cause, of *deceit and falsehood*, and defence of *ignorance*, so much as there is of *Malignity, Calumny, or making odious* the servants of Christ; so much as there is of *cruelty and destruction*, and *silencing faithful Ministers*, and *promoting ungodliness*, by upholding its defences, I am obliged to resist, as being from him, against whom in my baptismal Covenant I was engaged.

¶ 4. 2. He giveth his Reader the sum of my doctrine in this point, p. 29, &c. a chain of forgeries, or puerile falsehoods. Either he knew that he wrote falsely, or he did not; if yea, then it seems he thinks that God or his Church needed his lies: if not, how unfit is he to write against what he understandeth not? But what made him devise a frame of his own words of above six pages, to express my words by, if he meant not to deceive those that would believe his writing without reading mine?

¶ 4. 3. And whether it be from the Lord of love, or the enemy of love, that he goeth so far to the unchurching and damning of so many of the Reformed Churches, besides the Churches of the Southern and Eastern parts of the world (if not of all Churches on earth) let the sons of Love consider.

¶ 4. 4. And whether his endeavours to persuade all the *Nonconformists* to give over preaching Christs Gospel, and all publick Worship of God, till they can conscionably conform, and his reasonings for that frame that hath long excluded true discipline, and *shattered ignorance and ungodliness*, be of God, and all his copious discourses to that end, are to save souls, or to starve and murder them, I leave to mens impartial trial.

¶ 4. 5. I so often and fully repeated my judgment of the Calling of the Ministry, as leaveth his Forgeries inexcusable. The sum is this.

1. There is no power but of God. 2. Gods universal Laws are the prime Laws, and the only universal Laws of the Church or world.

3. In his Laws God hath established or instituted the work and the *species* of that Ecclesiastical Ministry which he will have to teach and guide his Church to the end of the world. And there-
 in signified his owning of them as sent by him, and promised them his help and blessing. 4. In that Law he hath told us what men they are that he will thus own and bless, and described the *Essentials* and the *Integrals* of their *Receptive* disposition or qualifications. 5. He hath in that Law told us who shall be the tryers and judges of the personal qualifications; and that *ordinis gratia*, ordinarily their approbation, choice, or consent, shall be a relative part of their Receptive qualification. 6. God himself giveth all the personal qualifications. 7. He is ready to help the approvers and chusers to discern all these, and to judge aright of them. 8. The person being thus made a capable Recipient by personal qualifications and relative (due Approbation, Election and Consent) God's Donation or Law doth give him *Right*, and *oblige* him to the office-work. And the Electors, Approvers, and Consenters, are none of the proper efficient Donors or causes of this *right* and *obligation*, but only efficient causes of his relative receptive capacity. 9. That therefore the *right* and *obligation* is immediately from Gods Law by resultancy, as the established medium of Gods conveyance; but not immediately without any means of his receptively, to make him *materiam dispositam*. 10. That all this is true both of Sovereign Civil Power, and of Church-power in Bishops and Pastors. 11. That yet besides Approbation and Election, God hath for the publick notice and order of the Church, appointed a Regular Ministerial Investiture, by which the Approved shall be solemnly put into possession (as Kings are crowned, and Ministers instituted): and *Ordination* usually containeth both the approbation, part of the election, and the investiture. 12. But this Investiture being but a Ministerial delivery of possession, proveth not the Investor to be any Donor of the Power to the *King*, or to the Bishop or Pastor. 13. Nor is it necessary save *ordinis gratia*, and *in foro ecclesie*, to avoid intrusion and confusion; but not when it is set against the end, or the end may and must be sought without it. 14. Who it is that hath the power of this Ordination (Approbation and Investiture) is much of the controversie of these times: some say it is the Magistrate: but those that say it is the bishops, are not agreed what species of bishops it is; whether the chief Pastors of each particular Parish true Church, or only a Dio-
 cesan

cesan that is the sole bishop of many parishes that are no true Churches; or only Diocefans that are Archbishops over many true Parish-churches and bishops. 15. But the *Fundamentum juris* being Christs Statute-Law or Grant, and all that is left to man being but *qualitatively* or *relatively* to make the person an immediately capable Recipient, and ministerially invest him; therefore it follows, that if at *Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, Cesarea, Constantinople, London*, all the old bishops were dead or hereticks, a just title may be restored without the ordination of one that had successive canonical ordination; because there needeth no efficient donor but Christ and his Law, and the receptive capacity may be without such ordination where it is not to be had (as among Papists that will not ordain one on lawful terms, &c.) for Order-itself is but for the *thing ordered*, and not against it: And *I will have mercy and not sacrifice* (morals before rituals); and *all power is to edification*, &c. are certain rules. And God never made men judges *in partem nostram libet*, whether there shall be Churches, and Pastors, and Worship, or none; or whether there shall be Civil Government or none; no, nor of what the *species* the Church-Offices shall be. 16. I use to explain this by many expository, similitudes. 1. If the Laws of God authorize Sovereignty, and the Constitution of the Kingdom say it shall be Monarchy; were it Elective, the Electors are not Efficients of power, but determiners of the Recipient: And if it be Hereditary or Elective, the Investors by coronation, are no efficients of the power; but Ministerial deliverers of possession, and that but necessary *ad ordinem*, and not *ad esse potestatis*.

2. If the King by a Charter to the University, state the power of the Chancellor, Vicechancellor, Proctors, and all the Masters of Colledges, and then tell them who shall be capable, and how chosen, and how invested; here his power is immediately from the Kings Charter, as the efficient Instrument; and all that others do is but to determine of the Recipient, and invest him.

3. So it is as to the power of the Lord Mayor of *London*, and the Mayors and Bailiffs of all Corporations.

4. So it is in the essential power of the Husband over the Wife; the woman chuseth who shall have it; and the Parson that marrieth them, investeth him in it; but God only is the efficient donor of his Law.

17. There-

17. Therefore it is not in the power of the Electors, Approvers, or Investors, to alter any of the Power established by God. If both the woman and the Priest say, that the man shall be her Husband, but shall have no government of her, it is a nullity; Gods Law shall stand. If the City and the Recorder say, You shall be Lord Mayor, but not have all the power given by the Kings Charter, its vain, and he shall have all that the Charter giveth him. If the *A Bp* crown the King, and say, You shall be King, but not have all the power stated by the *Constitution* on the King, this depriveth not the King of his power, (unless he give away that which God hath not stated on him, but men) so if an Ordaining Prelate, Patron, or Parish say, *This is a true Parish Church, and we choose, and Ordain you the true Pastor of it, but you shall have but part of the true Pastoral Power stablished on the office by God*, its null: Gods Institution shall be the measure of his power.

18. But I confess, that if God had left Church-Officers as much to the will of men as he hath done the Civil, the case had been otherwise; for Monarchy, Aristocracy, and Democracy, are all lawful: And the King, or other supreme power may make new *Species* of Judges, and Magistrates, and Officers, and alter them as they see cause. And it would have been so in the Church; if as the *Italians* at *Trent* would have carried it, Christ had immediately Instituted only the Papacy, and left it to the Pope to make Bishops, and to Bishops to make Priests: And yet I would not wrong the worst. I cannot say, that they would have empowered the Pope to change the *Species* of Priests or Bishops. But God hath fixed the *Species*, by making a settled Law for all the work, and all the *Authority* to do it, though Accidentals may be altered in work and Office.

§. 6. This is the clear state of my assertions, which how grossly Mr. *Dodwell* hath falsified in his forged description, I will not stay to open.

But it is a great Kress and fabrick that he layeth on the contrary supposition; that his *Species* of Bishops are the-givers of the Powers, and so we can have no other, or more than they are willing to give us: And let him that thinks he spoke a sentence of truth and sense, to prove it, enjoy his error. I would quickly prove the contrary to him, if I knew what he denieth.

§. 7. I. If he deny that God hath Instituted the Office of the sacred Ministry, and Pastorship in his Law, 1. The Scripture will shame him to all that believe, and understand it. 2. And if it be not divinely established, men may alter it; and what is all this stir about, to keep up their Domination?

§. 8. II. If he think that God hath only Instituted Teachers, or Rectors, *in genere*, but not in *Specie*, then I give him the same answer as before. Scripture will shame him, and men may make new *Species* of Church-Pastors, and unmake, or alter them; and how many, or how oft, who knows? And who be the men that have this Office-changing-power, that we may know whether, and how far, and how long we are bound to obey them?

§. 9. III. If he think that Gods Law hath not described the Essential Qualifications of the Recipient, then Prelates may make Pastors of *Infidels*, *Mahometans*, *Bedlams*, or *Blasphemers*, if not of *Horses* or *Dogs*.

§. 10. IV. If he think that Gods Law hath determined of no way of *Election*, *Approbation*, or *judging* who is capable, then every man may make himself a Bishop or Priest, and the *Turk* may make Bishops for Christians, or a company of *Lay-enemies* and persecutors may do it; and then the Bishops Judgment and Ordination will have no Divine Authority.

§. 11. V. If when the Recipient is duly qualified, and chosen, and capable, he does not think that Gods Law, or Grant, is a sufficient signification of his Donative will, and a *fundamentum juris*, and an *obliging* instrument, 1. He must deny the very nature and force of Gods Law, and Grant. And 2. He maketh it less effective than the Laws, Charters, and Donations of men are; For which he cannot have the least shew of true reason.

§. 12. VI.

§. 12. VI. Can he devise any other sort of power in the Ordainers, than I have named? What is it? If he say, that *they give the Office-power*; I ask, Is the controversie about the word [*Give*] or the Act? If that which I have named be called *giving*, let him use his liberty, and call it how he will. 1. But as to the *Thing*, what is it more than I have described? It is God, and not man that made the Office *in genere & specie*: Did our Bishops make the universal Law, which stablisheth the Office in the world? 2. And the Bishop never *had* that *power*, and therefore cannot give that which he had not: It's Dr. *Hammond's* reason against Presbyters ordaining, *Nemo dat quod non habet*. The word *Office* or *Power* and *Duty*, signifieth an *Accident*, which cannot *transfire a subiecto in subiectum*. The Ordainers have their *own power*, but they have not another mans. 3. Do they give it as Masters and Owners, or only as the Donors Ministers? No doubt they will say, as his Ministers. And do I need to prove to Mr. *Dodwell*, that servants are not the Donors, and *give not their own*, but *deliver their Masters*? Stewards themselves are but entrusted with the performance of their Masters will, in delivering his Goods as he requireth them.

§. 13. And this is so evident a truth, that the Papists themselves, who would fain have all power flow from the Pope, are yet forced to plead for it, (as you may see in *W. Johnson's*, alias *Terret's* answer to my first) because else they cannot defend the Papal Power. For the Pope hath been sometimes chosen by the *Roman* people, sometime by the *Roman* Presbyters, sometimes by people and Presbyters, sometime by the *Italian* Bishops, sometimes by Emperors, and now by Cardinals; and none of all these were Popes, nor had Papal power; and if they were the givers, must give what they never had: Whereupon the Papists are forced to grant that the Electors do but determine who shall be the Recipient, but that the power floweth to him immediately from Gods Law or Institution.

§. 14. And the Prelatists must needs say the same, or else grant, that Inferiors, that never had Superior power, may yet give it others; for how else shall the supreme Ecclesiastical power, in every National Church, be given? If it be in a Primate, or a
F Synod,

Synod, those that have not the supreme power must give it; for there is none above them, or equal to do it: And so Archbishops are chosen, and Councils called.

§. 15. And thus almost all Societies, by contract, are formed. e. g. The King giveth Commission to several men to List voluntary Souldiers, and be their Captains, and command them: Every Souldier chooseth his own Captain, and thereby subjeecteth himself to him; but it is not by giving him his power, for that floweth immediately from the Kings Commission; but by making himself a subject to it, and so making the Captain Relatively, a Recipient of power from God, and the King, over this particular man; for the Soldiers have no governing-power to give, nor are superiors to their Captain.

§. 16. And thus Servants improperly only make men their Masters, not by giving them a Domestick Ruling-power (which they never had themselves), but by making themselves the Correlate Subjects, and so putting their Masters into the Relation, to which Gods Law immediately giveth the Ruling-power: All the power is from God: and God doth not first give it the Servant, Souldier, &c. to give the Master, or Captain, but the Servants, or Souldiers consent is, a *Causa sine qua non, dispositiva Recipientis*, to make the Receiver capable of it from God.

§. 17. And indeed all Kings and Sovereigns thus hold their Sovereignty from God. Though God hath not made the form, *in Specie*, necessary; all power is of God, and the Sovereignty from him, by no mediate Efficient below his Law: It's a fallshood in politicks to say, that the people, as such, efficiently give the Sovereign his power, and that he is *universis minor* in Authority, though he is not *universis melior*; and therefore their common good is more than his, the *finis regiminis*. Nor is it true, that Richard Hooker saith, that in defect of Heirs it escheateth to the people; but only that it belongeth to the people to choose a new Recipient, to whom the power shall flow from Gods Law, and not from them. I do not think that the King of France, Spain, or England, will believe that their power is given efficiently by, and floweth from their People, Parliaments, or the

the Prelate that Crowneth them. And the case is evidently the same as to the Ministry.

§. 18. And the French Papists (by some called Protestants), who are for the Ecclesiastical Sovereignty of General Councils above the Pope, do not believe that the Pope giveth them their power, though he may call them: But whoever calleth them, or chooseth them, they suppose that God only giveth them their power.

§. 19. And in all these cases, it is notorious, that an interruption of due Election and Investiture, hindereth not the restoration of interrupted power. If the Law say, *whoever is thus and thus chosen to be Lord Chancellor, Lord Chief Justice, Lord Admiral, &c. shall have such, and such power, and be thus, and thus invested in the place*, if there were an intercession of an hundred years, the next person, so chosen, will from the Law immediately receive his power. And the Investiture is but for publick Order, and the Investors regular succession (no nor the act it self), never necessary, *ad esse*, where it cannot be had, as I proved against Mr. D. in my Book of *Concord*. The Archbishops succession that Crowneth him, is not necessary to the power of the King.

§. 20. And *obligation* to the Office-work, is as essential to the Officer, as is the power to do it: And it is only the Governours that lay on another an *obligation to duty* (except what by contract a man layeth on himself): and none are the obliging Governours of the highest Powers, Civil or Ecclesiastical, but God; therefore theirs must flow only from God. Therefore the thing is not unusual. And if Bishops were as much superior to Parish-Pastors, as the Lord Chancellor is to a Constable, yet they were but Governours of them, *in tantum quo ad exercitium*, and not Donors of their power: The Constables power is immediately from the Sovereigns Law, and so is the Ministers from Christ; for he is the only universal Sovereign.

§. 21. Mr. Dodwell saith, *These are bare similes.*

William Smith Book & March 27

Ans. These are plain explications of the conveyance of power from the Sovereign of all.

He saith, *That the power is not properly given by the Ordainer, is but begged by me.*

Ans. A begging affirmer may easily write Books at that rate.

But saith he, *They cannot give an instance from humane Charters, where the acts of men, not invested, are valid in Law.*

Ans. 1. Will you tell the King so to his face, that before his Coronation no act is valid that he doth? 2. No doubt but (as publick Matrimony after secret Marriage is necessary, *in foro civili ordinis gratia*, where it may be had, and yet when it was done by a Justice, without a Priest, yea, or by the persons publick contract only, it was no nullity, no, nor *coram Deo* before, so) to regular order, the most orderly Investiture is needful, but not *ad esse*, much less that all the Investors circumstances also, and all his predecessors, have been regular. 3. Investing here, is the act of a servant only, solemnizing the entrance, or delivery of possession: But such a servant is not the Owner, and Donor of the power. 4. The Papists and Protestants confess that the power of Investing is so humane and mutable, that it cannot be necessary, *ad esse potestatis*. I told you how oft the power of choosing and investing Popes hath been changed. And the old Canons make the Act of three Bishops necessary to Invest, or consecrate one. But did God determine of three? Or can you prove one Bishops Ordination a Nullity? 5. In the Civil-State some Officers are made without any Investiture (as Constables, Headboroughs, Church Wardens and others), and some the Charter imposeth Investiture on: But whether if Recorders, Stewards, Town Clerks, that by Charter are to Invest, be dead, or refuse their Act, the Mayor, Bayliff, or other Officers be therefore none, and the Government be dead, let Lawyers tell you. 6. Sure I am that *Hen. 4.* and the rest of the *Germanic* Emperors, who fought, and strove so long against *Hildebrand*, and his Adherents, for the Investing-power, were no Bishops; and all the Councils of Bishops, who stood for the Emperors, never took them for Bishops; and therefore thought not that Investing was an Act proper to Episcopal-power. 7. I have before proved, that ancient Writers, and Papists, and many Protestants agree, that Baptism is valid administered by

by Lay-men, that I say not women. 8. Mr. *Dodwell*, self-condemningly saith, that a presumptuous Ordination of the Priest serves to the validity of Sacraments, though indeed he were not Ordained; and that God is bound to make such Acts to the people good. 9. Mr. *D.* must beg belief instead of proving it, if he tell us, that the stated teaching of Gods Word to a Church, is not as truly the work of the Pastor, as is the Administering the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lords Supper. It is one of the principal of the Jesuits jugglings, to make the people think, that till they can prove their Teachers the rightly Ordained Ministers of Christ, they are not bound to hear them, or believe them. Our Parents (mostly) were never Ordained Bishops, or Priests: Must not Children therefore hear them, and believe them (*sic de humanâ*)? And hath not that God, who appointed Parents to teach his Law to their children, *lying down, and rising up*, and to educate them in the *nurture and admonition of the Lord*, thereby signified, that Parents instruction is the first ordinary means appointed by God for the conveying of saving knowledg, and faith? And if the help of Parents, though unordained, be *Gods ordinary means of the first saving faith*, shall We say with such men as Mr. *Dodwell*, that we have no Covenant right to salvation, till we have the Sacrament from the hand of a Minister that had a regular Ordination, uninterruptedly down from the Apostles? 10. Did the Three hundred, *Act. 2.* and the Eunuch, *Act. 8.* refuse Baptism till they were satisfied by proof, that the Baptizers were rightly called Ministers? *Paul* tells those that questioned his Apostolick power, that *he was an Apostle to them, whatever he was to others*; and that they should know first, whether Christ were in them, and so whether he were not a true Minister, and not begin at the trying of the Ministry, *2 Cor. 13. 4, 5, 6, 7. Gal. 3. 1, 2, 3, 4. &c.* 11. The Acts of the Parliament, called irregularly by General *Monk*, were they that restored King *Charles the 2d.* and were confirmed by him as valid, through the defect of a Regular Summons, and by necessity. 12. I have fully proved in my Treatise of Episcopacy, that the Species of Bishops, which Mr. *Dodwell* pleaded for, is not the same which the Churches had for 200. or 300. years. And then where is his regular succession from the Apostles?

§ 22. He saith also, p. 37. *They cannot give an Instance (of any power settled by Charter), whereupon the Acts of any persons, lawfully Invested, though confessedly less qualified, are not thought valid: A plain sign that their Investiture doth properly confer such power.*

Ans. Words fitted to deceive. 1. *He that is unqualified is not lawfully Invested, and yet the Act of the Investor may be right, had the Recipient been lawful.*

2. *He saith, Less qualified; when he knew that our question is of the unqualified.*

3. *Investiture giveth it, as the Act of the Power and Donor, by a servant delivering orderly possession, but doth not make, or prove the Investing Minister the Owner, or Donor, no more than he was that from the Emperor Henry delivered the Bishops the Staff and Ring; or the Priest that Marrieth the persons*

4. *Burroughs and Cities choose, and return Burgeses for Parliament by Charter; yet if they are unqualified when they come thither, the choice is judged null. If a City choose, and Invest a proclaimed Rebel for Mayor, I will believe it null, or invalid, though Mr. D. will not: And if he write Forty Books with such streams of confident words, to prove, that the Election, and Investiture of the declared Heretick Bishops at Alexandria, Antioch, Constantinople, and most of the Empire in many Ages (Arrians, Eutichians, &c.) were yet judged valid by the Councils of the Orthodox, no man that ever read the Councils will believe him.*

5. *Nor will I believe him, that any Bishops Ordination can make a true Bishop, or Priest, of a Woman, an Infant, or a professed Heathen, Infidel, or proper Heretick, or any incapable person, any more than he can make a Woman to be a Husband, or a dumb man the University Orator.*

§ 23. *He saith, They cannot give an Instance of any Power settled by Charter, whereupon a failure of all who are by the Charter empowered to dispose of Offices, the power must devolve to those who are not by the Charter empowered to dispose of them, and where such a Charter is not thought in Law to fail, by becoming unpracticable, till the supreme power interpose, &c.*

Ans.

Ans. Still the same fraud: If all empowered to dispose of Offices, is an ambiguous word. The Prince disposeth of them, by giving the Power, and the Electors by choosing the Receivers, and the Minister by delivering the *Insignia*: If Electors, and all die indeed, there are none to determine of the Receiver: And yet if the Plague kill most of the Electors at Age, and leave not a due number, when the rest left come to Age, and choose, the Charter will renew the Office-power. 2. But if it be only the Ministerial Investor that faileth, the sense of the Lawgiver must be judged of by the words, and by other notices, and the light of common Reason. *e. g.* Whether it be the meaning of the Charter which saith, that the Recorder shall give the Oath, or the former Mayor shall deliver the *Insignia*, that if the Recorder, or Mayor be dead, or sick, or mad, or wilfully refuse, the City shall have no Mayor; or if no Priest will Marry folks, all *England* must live unmarried; or if the Archbishops and Bishops will Ordain none but Hereticks, all the Churches must have no other Ministers. And here Nature and Christ teach us, that the Means is only for the End, and Order for the thing ordered; and God will have us understand his own Laws so, as that Rituals give place to Morals: *I will have mercy, and not sacrifice.* And sure if the King of *Spain* Charter, for the making of Governours at the *West-Indies*, should not express, or reasonably imply a Remedy, in case of the failure of circumstances of meer Order, his Countrey might be lost before they could send to *Spain* for a new Charter or new power.

And Mr. D. saith, *Which is the very case impugned by one of the Nonconformists*: And so judg whether he must nor turn a Seeker, and say, that all *Ministry, Churches, and Sacraments* cease, till a new Commission comes from Heaven, upon the failure of every such circumstance; yea, when almost all the Churches charge each other with failures and intercessions, and the very species of the *Ordainers* is so much altered.

If the King send his Army into the *Indies* (or his *Navies*), and mention no power but the Generals, as chief, or no way of choosing a new General, but by the Field-Officers choice, and giving him an Oath by the Secretary, &c. yet no man doubteth but it was his meanings that if the General die, or turn Rebel, yea, and the major part of the Field-Officers, or the

See

Secretary, the Army should choose another General, rather than perish, and the Kings service miscarry.

§. 24. He addeth, *They cannot give an Instance of any humane Charter, that ever allows any person empowered, to extend his own power by a private exposition of the Charter, against the sense of all the visible supreme powers of the Society.*

Ans. This opens the Core of the Aposthume.

1. We deny, as confidently as any *French*, or *Italians* affirm, that there is any such thing at a supreme *visible power* over the universal Church, under *Jesus Christ*; and therefore none such is disobeyed, or contradicted.

2. And we maintain, That by *Divine appointment* there is no visible National supreme Church-power, but that of the Civil Christian Sovereign; and therefore none such disobeyed.

3. And we hold, that no man can extend his own power further than *Christs own Law* extendeth it. False expositions give no power.

4. And therefore we prove by your own Rule, that (*Christ* being the only supreme universal Ruler, and having described and specified the Office of a *Pastor*, and order of a Church) no *Bishops* can by their private exposition, turn a single Church into a *Diocesan*, or a *Presbyter* of *Christs* description into an half *Presbyter* of their own making: But if they make a man a *Pastor*, his power and work shall be what *Christ* saith, and not what the *Ordainer* will. Investing-*Ministers Acts* are null, if they contradict the Order of the *Donor*: If the King give you a *Parsonage* of 300. *l.* a year, and the *Instituter* say, you shall have but 100. *l.* out of it, it's vain; he instituteth you but as the *Donors* instrument in the same *Benefice*, and power given by him.

§ 25. He addeth, p. 38. *Where can they find such a Charter for the power of Presbyters in Scripture as they speak of?*

Ans. Nay, then we are far from agreeing, if you think that the very *Species* of a *Pastors* Office is not found in Scripture, as of *Christs* institution. Then it seems, the *Bishops* make the very *Species*: The *Italian Bishops* at *Trent* scarce gave so much to the *Pope*. Then why may not the *Bishops* put down *Presbyters*, if they make the *Species*, or make as many *Species* as they

they please? Indeed Dr. *Hammond* thought that there was no evidence of the Order of Subject Presbyters in Scripture-times. And if God instituted none, let us have none. But I have told you before, and often, where in Scripture the true Pastors Office is described.

§. 26. He adds, *They may find some actual practices ; but will they call that a Charter ?*

Ans. This is indeed to strike at our foundation. If we prove not Christ to be King, and Lawgiver, and that his Laws, or Governing-precepts, were partly given by himself, and partly by his Spirit, in his Commissioned Apostles, and these Recorded, Sealed, and Delivered in Scripture : If we prove not, that these, as the authorized Agents of Christ, delivered his Will by words and practice, in settling, and describing the Pastors of his Churches, then take the Ministry, and spare not for mans invention. I cited you before, the Texts that are our proof.

But if the Office, which you call *Priestly*, be of mans making *in specie*, I doubt the Diocesans will prove so much more ; for many Papists doubt of the Divine right of Prelacy, that doubt not of the Divine unalterable right of the Priestly, or Presbyter-power and work. And will this cure men of Schism, to tell them, that God hath not so much as made, and specified the Parish-Pastors Office, and it is but a humane invention which you forsake ?

§. 27. And I would crave of this confident man to consider, whether he teach not high, and horrid Sacriledg, if he make the Investor to be first the *Owner*, and then the *Donor* ? Did we devote our selves to *Patrons* in our Ministry, or to Diocesans, or immediately to God ? If we covenanted only to be Gods Ministers, for the *Churches* good, then let them take heed that claim propriety in us as Priests. And if Tythes and Glebes were devoted to God, and not to Princes, or Patrons, I doubt he that maketh Patrons the Proprietaries, and proper Donors, will prove Sacrilegious, and be convinced at last, that he should only have taken Princes and Pastors for such Trustees as determine of the *Receiver*, but give not the things.

§. 28. If it be otherwise, Princes, Patrons, and Prelates, are greater and richer than I ever thought them. 1. Then, all the Bishopricks in *England* are the King's, till he give them. 2. Then all the Tythes, Glebes, and Temples in *England*, are the Patrons, till they give them; or else the Bishops, or Chancellors, who investeth men in them by institution and induction. And the Patron and Bishop may have a hard suit to determine which is the Proprietor. 3. And then a Bishop that Ordaineth a thousand Priests, was the *Owner* of all their Relations before; and so as they that are for the pre-existence of souls, dispute, whether they pre-existed individually, or only in *animâ universali*; so these that are for the pre-existence of Priesthoods in the Diocesans, must dispute, whether they were in the Prelate a thousand individual Priesthoods before, or but one common Priesthood, that fell into individuals by Ordination. If they say, that they were but *virtually* in the Prelate, that kills their Cause; for then they did not pre-exist (for *existere est esse, extra causas*). And this only saith, that the Prelate had an effective vertue that could make them. But the *species* was made before; and so was the obliging, and Donatiye Law; therefore the Prelate had not power to do what God had done before.

§. 29. I take it for granted (because I know him), that all this is nothing to Mr. *Dodwell*; but to me it is moreover something, 1. That the highest esteemers of Diocesans Ordination, make it but a Sacrament. 2. And that the Investing Minister is not the Owner and Donor of the Relation and Gift in any of their Seven Sacraments.

1. In Baptism God only giveth the Right and Relation, which the Minister by Investiture solemnizeth, but giveth it not as his own: Else every Lay-man and woman by their judgment, should have multitudes of Christendoms of their own to bestow.

2. In Confirmation the Priest never pretendeth to be the giver of the Spirit, but by his act to fit the person to receive it: The Holy Ghost is said to *fall on them that heard the word* (before Baptism), *Act. 10. 44. 45.* and they were after baptized: He fell on them, *Act. 11. 15.* And *Peter* and *John* pray-

ed

ed for the Samaritans, that they might receive the Holy Ghost, *Act. 8. 15.* and they laid hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost, *v. 17.* but not that they gave the Holy Ghost, though by the laying on of their hands, and their prayers, he was given, as he was on them without, *Act. 2.*

3. And in Matrimony it's confessed, that the Priest is not the Owner and Donor of the Husbands power, but a Ministerial In-
vester.

4. And in the Eucharist, even they that think the bread is made God, take not the Priest as the efficient cause, but a disposing instrument; nor that he *giveth* God to the Receiver, as the Owner, or Donor, but delivereth him as a Minister.

5. The same is true of Penance, Extreme-Uction, and therefore must be so also in *Ordination*.

If the King send a thousand Commissions to Captains, Judges, Justices, &c. the Messenger is not the Owner, or Donor of them all; nor may make any alteration of them: yea, if he intrust the Chancellor to name all the Justices, he doth thereby but determine of the person that shall receive the Commission, but altereth nothing of the Office, nor is the Donor of it. All this is plain to us, but not to Mr. *Dodwell*.

§. 30. Saith he, p. 39. *Are not many actual practices grounded on circumstances? Are not many of those circumstances obnoxious to great mutability? Are not ordinary Governours the competent Judges of their actual change?*

Ans. 1. And did not Christ promise his Spirit to his Apostles, for the performance of their Commissions? And were not those Commissions to gather, and settle his Churches, and teach them all that he commanded them? And did not Christ by that Spirit make *Pastors* and *Teachers*, as is before proved? And did not the Apostles faithfully perform their trust?

2. And doth he not see, that by this he also subverteth his foundation of Prelatical power also, as having no better institution than the Priesthood? And then who are those Governours of the Church that he talks of, that must judg? And how prove they their judging-power?

3. And it were a *kindness*, if he would tell us what change it is that the Diocesans may make in the Priestly Office and work, and tell us the bounds of their power, if it have any? And

whether they may put down the Preaching part, the Praying part, the Sacraments; or which of them? And whether this be the power that hath put out the Sacramental Cup, and made all the changes that are made in the Church. To tell us of these ordinary Governours *changing-power*, is a hard word to us, that took Christs Laws, delivered by his Spirit, to be perfect, and unchangeable; However, some circumstances are changed, which were noted to be but occasional.

§. 31. To return his Consequence, p. 40. *Since it is certain, that the power of Ordaining others, was not given to, nor for some hundred years exercised by that species of Diocelans, who were neither the Bishops of single Churches, associated for personal present Communion, nor were the Overseers of such Bishops, but the Bishops of Diocesses, that have many score, or hundred unbishoped stated worshipping Assemblies, it will follow by his arguing, that these never had their Office from the Apostles, and much less a continued succession of it.*

§. 32. He next pleadeth the Nullity of the Presbyterians Ordination. 1. Because if they had Ordaining power, it is only in Assemblies where Bishops are Presidents, and Edict them. 2. And because they carry it not by Plurality of Voices. But I am a weary with answering such trifling things, and the later part is a known mistake. I never heard of one contradicting Voice against the Ordination of any that was Ordained in our Synods.

§. 33. And he hath half disabled me to answer him from p. 50. forwards, where he feigneth me to maintain, that *Authority must necessarily result from true qualifications*: For it is taken for uncivil to give his words their proper name. But if the Reader will pardon the Repetition, I may remind him, how probable it is, that Mr. *Doddwell* trusted, that his Reader would believe his words without perusing what I wrote; where he might have seen, 1. That I say, that the *Authority resulteth not from the qualifications, but from Christs Law, Grant, or Charter*. 2. That *personal qualifications* (of gifts, or grace) are but a part of the necessary *Dispositive Recipients*; but that moreover there is needful, 1. Opportunity, 2. And need of his Office.

3. And

And to a Bishop the flock's consent, if not election. And *ordinis gratia*, (where moral necessity dispenseth not with order) the Ordainers approbation and consent. 5. And to regular possession, where it may be had, a due Investiture; so that there is a *Relative part* as well as a *Qualitative* of the Receptive disposition necessary. And all the following leaves in which he disputeth against me, as maintaining a *power resulting from meer qualities*, are so unbecoming a Divine, and a Christian, that I will not foul my paper with their due confutation. But they are suitable to that man who thinks himself wise, good and fit enough to Unchurch and condemn so much as he doth of the Christian world, on pretence of pleading for obedience to the Diocesans.

§. 34. And where he adds, p. 50. [*Or that it so depends on them (qualifications) as that where the persons ordained may want any of them, there the whole Ordination must be null, because of the incapacity of the matter.*] This also he denieth.

Ans. 1. I still distinguish between the *Qualifications* necessary *ad esse*, and those only *ad bene esse*, or integral. If he would persuade the Reader that I null Ordination for want of the latter, his weakness, or designed ill intent is such as warneth his Readers to take heed of believing him. If he mean it only of the former, as I speak, I have before confuted him that dare say that no qualification is necessary *ad esse*. Then a Pope *Joan*, or woman-Priest or Prelate, or a professed enemy of God or Christ may be a Priest. And he may be a Pastor of a Church to feed them by the Word, who never heard or knew what was the Word or Church. Cannot the best believer go to Heaven, if all your Priests will but deny him the Sacrament? and yet may a man be validly a Bishop, and the Key-keeper of Heaven that believeth not that there is a God, a Christ or Heaven, and so professeth? This maketh me remember the old *Roman* Canons, how no Bishop must be deposed for lying with his own Sister, unless a great multitude of Witnesses testify it; and the Councils that decreed no Layman shall witness against a Clergyman, &c.

But Election, consent, the Ordainers approbation (ordinarily) are part of my Qualifications. And if these be unnecessary, what doth the man plead for? And is a false approbation of a man that wanteth Essentials, more necessary than having them? How contrary is this to the Doctrine of the Council of *Carthage* in the Epi-

file

file in *Cyprian*, of *Martial* and *Easilides*; and to many honest Councils?

§ 35. P. 90. At the end of this insinuated false accusation, he asketh, [*Where do we find that God ever gave Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons, (though he gave Apostles, Pastors and Teachers) ? those extraordinary Offices indeed seem to have been made neither of man, nor by man, but by God immediately, &c.*]

Ans. 1. Hath he said a word to prove that *Pastors and Teachers are not ordinary Officers*, contrary to the common judgment of the Church in all ages? 2. Whether he mean [*Bishops*] in the Dative Case, or the Accusative, I know not. If the later, let him speak out and say, *God gave not Bishops*. But how proveth he that *Presbyters* (and *Bishops*) are not *Pastors* or *Teachers*? 3. The Text tells you, *Ephes. 4. 14, 15, 16.* that these offices were given for the continued stated use of the Church: *For the perfecting of the Saints, the work of the Ministry, for the edifying the body of Christ, till we all come in the unity of the faith, and the knowledg of the Son of God, to a perfect man, &c.* Was this temporary? 4. It seems he disclaimeth *Bishops* being made, in making *Apostles*. 5. Christ by his Spirit in the *Apostles* ordered the Churches.

§ 36. P. 65. he saith, [*They never find any of those Officers to whom succession is at present pretended, made immediately by God, but by the intervention of men, &c.*]

Ans. Still deceiving confusion: 1. *Intervention* is a word of fraud, and may signifie only that act which determineth of, and qualifieth the receiver; and it may signifie the *Donation*, or *making* of the office. It is this that we speak of. 2. The *Intervention* of infallibly inspired men, commissioned to deliver and record Christ's own will, hath an efficiency instrumental in making the office, in that the Spirit in them doth it, and they do make instrumentally the Charter or Law which giveth the power; and Christ doth what they did by his Commission and Spirit. If you can prove that our Diocesans have this Commission, spirit and power, if they write new Sacred Scriptures, or make new Sacraments, and Church-forms, and offices, we will obey them. But prove it well.

3. Did any man but Christ send forth the Seventy? Yet most Prelatists hold, that those were the predecessors of the Presbyters.

4. By

4. By this it seems he again denieth, that Christ himself instituted the Order of Bishops, by making Apostles. And if so, he will forely shake his standing; for then they must prove all their power from the Apostles (or following persons) institutions, and not make them successors of the Apostles own Office (for they made not their own Office). And Dr. *Stillingfleet* thinks there were no Bishops, or few made in the Apostles times, as Dr. *Hammond* thinks of subject-Presbyters. And if Christs Spirit in the Apostles made not these Offices (who made the Scripture, which is Gods Law), I despair of seeing it proved, that any since them were authorized to make them. And if men only made the Episcopal and Presbyters Office, men may unmake them.

§. 37. A case put to me within this hour, remindeth me, how much these men prefer Ordination, not only in it self, but in this circumstance of Prelatical uninterrupted succession, before Baptism, which is our Christning. There are some godly young men that have Communicated in the Lords Supper, that were the children of Quakers and Anabaptists; some were never baptized, and some know not whether they were, or not; and being born near Two hundred Miles hence, cannot learn or come to any certainty. The question is, Whether these that have Communicated, should yet be baptized? which is to make Christians of Christians? Or whether the higher Sacrament do not eminently contain the lower, as making a man a Bishop, containeth making him a Presbyter, and that containeth eminently his Deaconship (as some say)? If they must be baptized, yet, it implieth the Nullity of their Sacramental Communion before: And if so, Mr. *Dodwell* must confess, that Priestly exhibition, or investiture is null to an incapable Subject. But I think most will say, that he should not be baptized, it being done interpretatively. And if so, is his Prelatical mode of Ordination more necessary than actual Baptism? Besides, that (as is said) they make Lay-mens or womens baptizing sufficient *ad esse*. And yet the Church of *England* professeth, that only the Two Sacraments, Baptism and the Lords Supper, are generally necessary to salvation.

§. 38. *Pag. 67, 68.* He would persuade us that the *Imposition of hands in Ordination* signifieth what he asserteth. But he giveth us not one word of proof of it. Was it the *Holy Ghost* which was in the imposing *Apostle or Prelate* that was given by him, and out of him into the Ordained? No, he was never in Scripture said to be the *Owner, Donor, or efficient conveyer* of the Holy Ghost. But Gods will made the Imposition of the Apostles hand, a conditional act to qualifie the recipient to receive the Holy Ghost immediately from God, as the Texts before cited, and many more prove. What if it be once said that [*Διὰ τῆς ἐπιθεσῶς τῶν χειρῶν τῶν ἀποστόλων διδοῖται τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον,*] when many other Texts expound it? It's well known that *Διὰ* signifieth many other causes, mediums, conditions, as well as efficient conveying causes. Is it like to signifie more here than in the Doctrine of Justification, when it is so oft said that we are *justified by faith*? And yet faith there, is no efficient instrument conveying or giving us pardon and relative Justification, but only a necessary qualification of the Recipient (called by Dr. Twisse, *Causa dispositiva*, which is part of the *Materialis*) upon which Gods Covenant immediately pardoneth and justifieth the believer; so both there and here it is *by or through* the Act of man, as a moral qualification of the Recipient, made a condition by God.

§. 39. After all this, the man cometh himself *pag. 72.* to distinguish of *Qualifications necessary to the being of the office, and to the well-being*; yea, and hath the face to say, that I should have distinguished them; as if I had not ever done it. Is it not an unprofitable toil to dispute with such men that will pretend that a case by me constantly stated was not stated, and then will long dispute himself for the unqualified without distinction, and after all distinguish in the sag-end? This becometh not any man that will pretend to plead for truth.

But yet he will not be over-liberal to us; he saith *p. 13.* *All the skill that is requisite essentially, is only in general to know the benefits to be performed on Gods part, and the duties to be promised on mans, and the nature and obligation of Covenants in general; and the particular solemnities of Ecclesiastical Covenanting. And of this how can any one be incapable, that is but capable of understanding the common dealings of the world?*

Ans. w.

Ans. 1. And yet must we have Universities? and must the Holy Ghost be given by the Bishops for this? And is there any need to open the Bible to know it? and must so much riches and honour maintain this much? and all be damned Schismatics that turn to better?

2. Set this qualified Ministry and his great zeal to persuade the *Nonconformists* to cease Preaching, and his Unchurching the Reformed Churches altogether; and it's easie to see what this humble diligent man is labouring for.

3. Do not many millions *understand the common dealings of the world*, that understand not the Gospel? The natural man receiveth not the things that be of God, for they are spiritually discerned.

4. Is not this a plain design to set up a carnal Kingdom of ignorant, vicious Clergy-men, such as *St. Paul* saith, *Rom. 8.* neither are nor can be subject to Gods Law, instead of a holy Catholick Church and Communion of Saints? and to make *Mahometans* think that they are Saints in comparison of us, and that Christians are an unholy sort of men?

5. Either he includeth all that is *necessary* to the things named by him, or not. If not, then *his Priest must know the benefits of Gods Covenant, without knowing what God is, or that Christ is the Purchaser, Covenantor, &c.* If yea, (which I doubt not he will say) then, *O what an excellent body of Theology is included in these few general words!* Then he must know all those Attributes of God and his Relations to man, by which he is said to be *our God*. He must know all the necessary articles of faith, about the Person of Christ, as God and man in two Natures and one Person, his Incarnation, Birth, Life, Sufferings, Death, Burial! his Doctrine, his Merits, his Resurrection, Ascension, Glory, Intercession, Kingly and Prophetical office, and last Judgment, and Glorious Kingdom. He must know what Covenant God formerly made, and man broke; and what sin, original and actual, and what curse and condemnation followed on mankind. And Oh how many great and mysterious things are contained in Gods Covenant-benefits! Our Union with Christ, Reconciliation, Justification, Adoption, Sanctification; The Doctrine of the Holy Ghost as the Third person in the Trinity, and as the Inspirer of Prophets and Apostles, and Inditer and confirmer of the Scriptures, and the Witness of Christ, and the Sanctifier and Comforter of the Elect, besides Resurrection, Glorification, &c. And what a deal is contained in mans necessary qua-

William Smith's Book. March 27 1729

fification (Faith, Repentance), and promised duty? And the true nature and use of the Sacraments themselves? And is all this such a small or easie matter as he seems to intimate?

6. But hath he yet proved that a true Minister of Christ hath no necessary work but thus to administer Sacraments? I will yet believe, 2 *Tim.* 4. 1, 2. that he must preach the Word in season, out of season, reprove, rebuke, exhort, partly to convert the unconverted, partly to confirm and guide believers; and that the people should ask the Law at his mouth as being the messenger of the Lord of Hosts. And that the very essence of his office is to be a Minister under the *Teaching, Priestly* and *Ruling* office of Christ.

7. And if he had proved that a sorry Priest hath all that is essential to his office, that proveth not that I must take him for my Pastor, no not though the Diocesan command me. Souls are more worth than to be wilfully made the Priests and Prelates merchandize. If a man have all essential to a Physician, and no more, I will not trust my life to his skill, which is less than my soul, though the Bishop bid me. If a woman have all that's essential to a woman, he is a fool that will take her for his wife, because the Bishop bids him, if she have no more. The Priests that the Pope sent from *Italy* into *England* that could speak no *English*, knew what you mention perhaps. But it's necessary also that the Pastor teach all this knowledge to all the flock, which is not done with saying a few words. This man minds me of the saying of an Atheistical Physician, *What needs there all this preaching and stir? I can tell them all in three words, it is but think well, and say well, and do well.* Dr. Saywell, and Mr. Dodwell that are so much for our silence, seem to be too near to this mans mind. But saith St. Paul, *Who is sufficient for these things!*

8. Yet this sort of men that can accept of so little of God in the Priests, so be it they will but be ruled by the Prelate (who I suppose need *ad esse* be no wiser or better himself in their opinion) are the rigidest silencers and excommunicators of others the wisest and holiest Pastors and Christians, as Schismatics, or Hereticks, if they obey not the Diocesan in every indifferent thing, or be not of their mind in what they decree; such odds is in their demands for God, and for the Prelates.

He that doth but *understand the common dealings of the world*, is capable of saying over the Liturgy of the Sacrament; and a little know-

knowledg, and no honesty or piety, may serve *ad esse*. But if the Councils of Prelates, yea or his single Diocesan command him never so many things as indifferent, which the poor Priest feareth are perjury, lying, false worship, or other heinous sins, he is to be Excommunicated from Christian society, and cast out of the Ministry, and as a Schismatick not only to be silenced, but to be damned, if such as Mr. Saywell and Mr. Dodwell, and their Masters be to be believed.

§. 40. But saith he, P. 74. *How can they prove that Preaching is at all any essential part of the Office? &c.*

Ans. 1. From Christs own practice, and his command to those whom he called and sent, and from their practice, and the Holy Ghosts determination by them, *Mat.* 4. 17. & 10. 7. & 11. 1. *Mar.* 1. 4, 38. & 3. 14. *Luk.* 4. 18, 19, 43. & 9. 2, 60. *Act.* 5. 42. & 10. 42. *Rom.* 10. 8, 10, 14, 15. *Mat.* 28. 19 *Mar.* 16. 16, 20. *Act.* 30. 20. & 8. 5, 25, 40 & 9. 20. & 13. 5, 42. & 20. 7, 20, to the end. *Phil.* 1. 17, 18. 1 *Tim.* 3. 16. 2 *Tim.* 3. 16. 2 *Tim.* 4. 1, 2. 1 *Cor.* 1. 21. 2 *Tim.* 2. 2, 24. *Tit.* 2. 3. Where do you find that ever any one in the New Testament was ordained a Mass Priest, or Sacrament-Priest, and not a Teacher?

2. When did you prove that actual giving the Sacrament was essential to a Bishop or Presbyter? not only; *Paul* baptized few, but many Parish-Priests leave that work to their Curates, and some Bishops leave both the Sacraments to their Chaplains or Priests. I suppose you know that in the ancient Churches one Assembly had usually a Bishop with many Presbyters and Deacons; and usually the Bishop did both preach and celebrate the Eucharist? Can you prove that the rest did any oftner celebrate than preach?

3. But if you are willing, you may easily know that we take *Preaching* to have more modes than making a set Sermon in the Pulpit. The Presbyters of old were all Preachers; Sometimes in the Pulpit when the Bishop or chief speaker was absent, sick or required it; Sometimes to smaller parties in Houses or Chappels, or lesser meetings; sometime by conference, as *Christ* preached to the Woman, *Joh.* 4. And if you think otherwise, yet I am confident by experience, that it is an easier thing, and requireth less skill to make a Pulpit studied Sermon, than to deal convincingly in conference with particular persons that need our teaching. And a man may learn to say Mass or Liturgies, that hath no tolerable fitness to teach.

4. But if Preaching and Teaching be all one with you as they are with me, is it not a strange question to ask, *How we prove that Preaching, that is, Teaching, is at all essential to their Office?* As if you should ask, *How we prove that Teaching is essential to a Schoolmaster or Tutor?* or that to Rule is essential to a Ruler; or to give Physick essential to a Physician? What can you take the Office to be that includeth not Teaching? Neither Christs Apostles, nor the ancient Church ever ordained any to give Sacraments without Teaching; (however *Papists* make the essence of the Priesthood to be in the power of making the body and blood of God.) Nay, how can they celebrate the Sacraments without Preaching or Teaching? Can they justly baptize the adult, and not teach them the great Articles of the Creed which they must profess? and the great and many duties to be done? and the great and many benefits to be received? And doth he think it such a small and easie matter to teach men all the Articles of the Creed, the sense of the Lords prayer, the Ten Commandments, and the nature of the Sacrament of Baptism, and the Lords-supper? It may be he will say, that it is some other Preaching that he meaneth. But he speaketh to me, who (in the hearing of Dr. *Warmstrie*, and of Mr. *Th. Baldwin*, who is yet living) did offer Bishop *Morley* when he forbade me to preach in his Diocese, to promise him to preach only the Catechism-Doctrine, on Baptism, the Creed, the Lords-prayer, the Ten Commandments, and the Lords-supper. Archbishop *Usher* in his Sermon before King *James*, on *Ephs* 4. 3. boldly affirmeth, That let the learnedst of them all try it when they will, they shall find that it requireth greater skill to open to the ignorant intelligibly these Catechism common truths, than to handle points of controverted School-Divinity.

§. 41. It may be objected, 1 *Cor.* 12. *Are all Teachers?* and *Rom.* 12. *He that teacheth on teaching.*

Ans. It's evident that Teachers or Doctors are there put for some eminently gifted above others in opening and defending sound Doctrine, and not for all Teachers in general. For *Exhortation* is distinguished from it, which yet is the greatest part of most Sermons. *Paul* was the chief Speaker, yet *Barnabas* was a Teacher. We are more than he is, for many Ministers in each Church, where the chief Speaker shall usually preach; but the other as assistants in their time and place, and not to be meer Sacramenters.

§. 42. His

§. 42. His next recollections run all upon such intimated or expressed untruths merely forged by him contrary to my copious Explications, and against the rules of common honesty, that I will not lose my own and the Readers time in particular answers to them. He would persuade the Readers that I affirm that *power immediately results from gifts*, who never had such a thought, but say it neither resulteth from them, mediately nor immediately. This dealing is so grossly false, that it is neither credit to his cause nor him. Would he make men think that I take him to have most authority or power, that hath the best gifts? As if the wisest and best man had right to the Crown or Church-power? If copious discourses to the contrary will not hinder such busie disputers from such inhumane slanders, are they meet to be disputed with? I have over and over said that, 1. Gifts, or the best abilities. 2. And due *election or approbation* of the Ordainers. 3. And the peoples election and consent, all set together, do but make up the Qualification or Receptive disposition of the Recipient. 4. Yea, and his consent conjoined; and that where all these in the necessary degree concur, the power resulteth to that capable person from none of them all, but immediately from God-Law, which is his instrument giving power to persons so qualified. And that besides all these, Ministerial Investiture for Orders sake, when it may be had, should introduce him into possession; yea, and the Magistrate must be judg whom he will countenance, protect or tolerate. But the case of Ordination and Investiture are necessary only where they may be had lawfully, and without crossing their end; as *sacrifice was compared with mercy*, and the Rest of the Sabbath compared to works of charity and necessity.

§. 43. And as it is the trick of such dealers, p. 81. he must have Governours to do his work, and therefore must not leave out that which may make us odious to them; but tells men, that our *Hypothesis is unreconcilable with government in this life*, in that it permits persons to assume Authority, and to extend it as far as they think fit, by appealing to Writings against the sense of all that oppose authority of this life.

Ans. 1. But this *Hypothesis* is none of his Adversaries, but come out of the Mouth of the forger of Inventers, what shall such men be called?

2. We

2. We permit no person to *assume Authority*. But *Writings* are not so contemptible to us in comparison of that which you take to be *all the visible Authority of the Church*. It is your *Richard Hooker* that saith, that the Law *maketh the King, and giveth and measurcth his power*, and that it's *usurpation which obligeth no mans Conscience*, when power is taken, and used which the Law never gave. What I think of this, I have elsewhere shewed. The *Statutes* are not so contemptible in this case, but the great Lawyers think they may be appealed to from *visible Rulers* in several cases. And you must talk at other rates than you have done in your tedious fallacious Vagaries, before wise Christians will believe that we may not appeal from Prelates to the written Word of God, when the power used by them is justly questioned. If not, how came the Reformed Churches to justify their Reformation? Was it not by appealing to Scripture against the visible Church Rulers, that were commonly against them? Were not Popes, Councils, Prelates, and Priests against them, for the far greatest part? Did it overthrow all Government of the world to appeal from these to the Scripture? I hereby undertake to prove, that neither Popes, Prelates, or Priests, have any Church-Authority, but what God hath given them by his Word. And is it not then necessary to try it by that Word? Must we take their own words for all that Popes, or Prelates claim? And it will put the Pope and Council hard to it, to prove any Authority from God, if the Scripture do not give it them: And if it give it them, it may give it others.

§. 44. And when all's done, we are far from granting, that we have less to shew for our succession from the Apostles, than Popes or Diocesans have.

1. We are sure that we have the same Baptism, Eucharist, Creed, Lords Prayer, Decalogue, and Scripture, delivered down from the Apostles. 2. We are sure that we have a Ministry of the same *species* which Christ and his Spirit in the Apostles instituted. 3. We know that our Churches, and Worship, and Doctrine, are the same that are described, and settled by the Apostles. 4. We know that our present Ministers are qualified as the Apostles required. 5. And that they are Elected, or consented to by the Flocks, as the Apostles required. 6. And that

that they have as good an Ordination, and Investiture, as the Apostles ever made necessary to the Ministry: That is,

1. They have the Approbation of *senior* Pastors, and many of them of Diocesans. All that were put into any places by the Parliament, when the Bishops were down, were to have the *Westminster* Assemblies Approbation under their hands. And that Assembly, as called, consisted of many Diocesans, with many score grave Eminent Divines, though the Diocesans were not actually present. And a signed Approbation, and Allowance, hath the Essence of all that is of absolute necessity in Ordination.

2. They were Ordained by true Bishops. 1. All true Presbyters are *Episcopi gregis*, and joya in Ordination here in *England*. 2 The chief Pastors of City-Churches, having Curates under them, are *Episcopi Eminentes vel Praesides*, such as Ordained for above Two hundred years after the Apostles. And 3. The chosen Presidents of Synods were such Bishops. But all these concurred in the Nonconformists Ordinations when the Diocesans were down. They were Ordained at, and by a Synod of Presbyters in some great Town, or City, where the Moderator, and the chief City-Pastors were part.

3. Many of them were Ordained by Diocesans.

4. Many Ordained, as aforesaid, were after approved by Diocesans, some by Imposition of Hands, and all by Word, or Writing; for Archbishop *Usher* did in my hearing by Word and in Writing more publicly declare his opinion of such Presbyters Ordination as valid (though he excused not such as deposed the Diocesans from the guilt of Schism); and so did the many other Bishops, whom I formerly cited; yea, even *Ban-croft* himself. And surely all this hath all that is essential to Ordination.

5. And we know that such a Ministry hath continued to propagate the Church and Gospel in the world since the Apostles days.

But we confess, 1. That we cannot prove, that such Ministers have still succeeded in the same Towns. 2. Nor that no one, from whom their Ordination came down from the Apostles, did pretend to have Orders, or Authority when he had none. 3. Or that no one of them in 1660 years was an Heretick, or a Schismatick, or a Papist. 4. Or that no one Ordained

dained in wrong words. 5. Or that no one Ordained contrary to the Canons, out of his own limits, or without three Bishops, or without the Presbyters. 6. Or that no Competitors were Ordained by several Bishops. Mr. *Dodwell* is a great Historian; when he hath proved all this of all, or any of his Clergy-friends, he hath done something more than multiply words.

§. 45. But on the other side, we can easily prove, and have proved, 1. That our Diocesans are not of the same *species* with those of old. 2. That the Apostles did not make them. I think Mr. *Dodwell* will say, that the Presbyters first made them by consent (the Children begot the Fathers). 3. And Dr. *Hammond* will defend it, that there is no certainty, that any Subject Presbyters were made by the Apostles in Scripture times. So that the very *species* of their Clergy hath no such succession, as distinct from ours. 4. And he that will read the Church-History, and Councils, declaring the multitude of doleful intercessions in East and West by Heresies, the Patriarchs of *Alexandria*, *Antioch*, *Constantinople*, *Jerusalem* and *Rome*, and most of the chief Seats of Bishops, having been judged Hereticks, Simoniacks, or no Bishops by General Councils; yea, *Roman* Bishops, judged some of them Infidels, and Diabolical by the Councils of *Constance* *Basil*, &c. I say, he that knoweth this History, must know, that the Diocesans that from these derive their succession, have certainly had frequent and notorious intercessions.

§. 46. And this leads me to another part of Mr. *Dodwell's* work: viz. his proof that *Aidan* and *Finan* were Bishops. As if this had been a great part of his Cause. Such diverting noise is a great part of the art of deceiving. Because I had said, that *Aidan* and *Finan* were not Bishops, but Presbyters, that is, when they came out of *Scotland* into *Northumberland*, I apprehended that some men of his genius and design, would be willing to mistake me, and therefore Printed an Explication of the Words in the end of my first Answer to Dr. *Stillingfleet*. But Mr. *D.* would have men think that I said, that they were never made and called Bishops at all; and that I read not *Beda*, from whom alone (near Five and Thirty years ago) I took almost all that I assert concerning them. Let the

Rea-

Reader see my forefaid Explication. If Mr. *Dodwell* will give us more than noife and mift about this matter :

1. Let him prove that it was Diocefan Bifhops that Ordained thefe *Scots* before they came into *England*, when *Beda* faith they were fent from thofe Monafteries that were ruled by Presbyters, and which would not fo much as eat or communicate with the *Roman* Bifhops.

2. Let him prove that any Bifhops in *England* Consecrated hem, or made them Bifhops here, when *Beda* tells us that they were the firft in the North, and therefore had none here to Ordain them.

3. Let him prove that they were here made true Diocefan Bifhops of our *species* : When, 1. they had no Presbyters at firft under them, and therefore ruled none, and had but one Congregation; for one man can be but in one place at once. 2. Their Church in *Lindisfarne* was not made of ftone, but of wood, covered or thatcht with reeds, and they are not faid to have any other Church under them. 3. They went indeed to preach all over the Country, but not as to a Church, but as to Heathens to convert them.

4. Let him prove that ever they took themfelves to be of a diftinct order from Presbyters. 5. At a Synod (*Bed. c. 25.*) we find no more but the King and his Son, and *Hilda* a woman-Abbeffe, and three or four of this fort of Bifhops, (far below our Ordaining City-Presbyters and their Synods.)

But unlearned men that value Books by intereft and preconceived opinions, may think that by fuch talk Mr. *Dodwell* hath done fome great matter. -

§. 47. But (faith he, p. 81, 82.) *Our Hypothefis obliging inferiour Governours to prove their title to their office, and the extent of it, from the intention of their fupream Governours, does oblige all to a ftrict dependance on the fupreme vifible power, fo as to leave no place for appeal concerning the practice of fuch Government (which as it lafts only for this life, fo it ought not to admit of difputes more lafting than its practice), &c.*

Ans. Alas for the poor world and Church that will be cheated at fo grofs a rate !

1. Did you not know that the grand error that Proteftants charge *Papifts* with, is the asserting of any fuch thing as a *fupreme vifible power over the Church univerfal befides Chrift*. And did you think that your roteing over the name to them that deny the thing, would

would make a wise man change his Religion?

2. By your Hypothesis then no man can prove his title to his Office, who either believeth not that there is any such universal Supreme, or that knoweth not who it is (I know no Competitors but the Pope, and General Councils, unless the Patriarch of *Constantinople* be one.)

3. And he that knoweth not the *intention* of this Supreme power, is still unable to prove his office.

4. And he that knoweth the intention of the Ordaining Diocesan, is never the better if he know not the intention of the Supreme. And what if the intention of the Supreme, and of the Diocesan are contrary?

5. But by your *Hypothesis* the Governours may alter the very *species* of the Priesthood as they please; and what ever God saith of it in his Institution or Law, it must be to us no other in kind or extent, than the Governours intend. If they say, *I ordain thee to baptize, but not to teach*; or to do both, but not to celebrate the Lords-Supper; or to do that, but not to pray or praise God; or not to use the Keys of the Church, our power is limited accordingly; Then if the Prelates make Mass-Priests, their intention is the measure of their power. Answer the *Papists* then that ask, Was it ever the intention of the Pope and his Prelates, that the *English* Bishops should disclaim the Pope, or the Mass, or reform without them as they did?

6. Seeing the *English* Bishops, by you, derive their succession from *Willfred*, and *Augustine*, and *Rome*, is not the Church of *Rome* the fittest Judge of the extent of their power, as knowing their own intentions? Nay, if they were so blind as to intend them power to pull down themselves, may they not recall it?

7. Did ever Protestant preach this Doctrine, *That there is no appeal from the supreme Prelates, to God*? O dreadful! what may men come to? and what error so great that a former may not introduce? Disgrace not the Church of *England* so much as thus to intimate, that they set up themselves so as that there is no appeal to Scripture, or God himself from them? God hath commanded Preaching, Praying, Praises, Baptism, the Lords-Supper, holy assemblies, &c. if the supreme Prelates interdict and forbid all these, is there no appeal to God? I have told you how much *Robert* *Grafthead* abhor'd this Doctrine, and so told Pope *Innocent* the 4th. What absolute blind obedience to Prelates is this!

8. And

8. And what a reason brings he, *That the practice lasteth only for this life, and therefore, &c.* Doth any of our actions here last longer than while they are doing? Praying, Praise, Sacraments, obeying the King, doing good to the poor, &c. and so swearing, cursing, adultery, rebellion, atheism, blasphemy here, last only for this life. Must we therefore obey men without appeal to God, if they forbid us all duty, and command all sin?

9. And what did the man mean when he said, *That it ought not to admit of disputes more lasting than its practice.* Is this the rate of these mens wise disputations? 1. A murderers practice may be disputed at the Assizes when his act is past. 2. Shall not all the actions of men in this world be examined and judged of by Christ hereafter? What? no men judged according to their works, or for any thing done in the body? 3. Or did he mean that God will justify us for any Villany that we shall do in obedience to the Supreme Clergy? 4. Or did he think that by appealing to Gods judgment, we challenge them there to dispute with us? What to make of this mans demonstrations, little do I know.

§. 48. He adds, P. 82. *For how fallible soever they may be conceived to be in expounding Scripture, yet none can deny them to be the most certain, as well as the most competent Judges of their own intentions.*

Ans. 1. That's true. And if their intentions may make Doctrine, Worship, and Priesthood, what they please, it much concerneth us that they conceal not their intentions! But I would I knew whose intention this must be; whether the supreme Clergies, or the Ordainers; and what to do if divers mens intentions differ, and what bounds are set to their intentions; and how many hundred sorts of Priests Doctrine or worship they may make.

2. You touch their fallibility tenderly, as a thing that *some may conceive.* But it seems let them never so falsely expound Scripture, their own intentions still shall prevail against all the word of God? I would you would answer Dr. Stillingfleet's *Rational Account*, which confuteth you.

§. 49. He proceeds, *As certainly therefore as God hath made his Church a visible society, and constituted a visible Government in it, so certainly it is to be presumed that their Hypothesis must be false, &c.*

Ans. 1. Trifle not at this deceiving rate with plain men that
I 2 love

love the light. If by a *visible Society with a visible Government*, you mean (as we have great reason to think), *With a visible Government over it besides Christ*, do not thus as Mr. Thorndike and others of you do, go on to beg it, and build vast structures on it, but *prove it to us* and we will yield; prove to me that the *Universal Church is a Society that must have one visible supreme Government under Christ*, and I here declare to you, that I will turn *Papist* presently, and will not wrangle against any man for calling me a *Papist* (though I may not own all that Popes say and do, as those do that *Grotius* called *Papists*.) I will not talk with Bishop *Gunning* of a *Collegium Pastorum*, governing all the Christian world *per literas formatas*; nor be so moderate as those *French* *Papists* that make an *Universal Council* (which never was, nor ever must be, the supreme Church-power. I will presently be for the Pope, though not *as absolute*. But why answer you not what we have said against it? particularly my Sermon in the Morning-Lectures against Popery.

2. But if by a *visible power in the Church*, you mean not *one over the Church*, the *Independents* deny it not; while every City hath its proper Mayor, (and so every Church its Pastor) it is a *visible power in the Kingdom*, but not *over it* as a Kingdom. All the *Justices of Peace* are *visible powers in the Kingdom*, but not *Supreme*, nor as one *Aristocracy* over the whole.

Seeing all my dissent from Popery, and from you, is founded in my judgment against *any one universal Supreme besides Christ*, (Monarch, Aristocracy, or Democracy, I seriously intreat you to write your strongest arguments on that subject to convince me, and answer what I have said to Mr. *Johnson*, and you may spare all the rest of your labour as to me. This will do all.

§. 50. P. 83. He adds, *How can subjects preserve their due Subordination to their Superiors if they practice differently? and while they defend their practices, and pretend Divine authority for them?*

Ans. 1. As the three Confessors did, *Dan. 3.* and as *Daniel* did, *Dan. 6.* and as the Apostles did, *Act. 2. & 3. & 4.* And as all the Bishops and Churches did for three hundred years. And as the Orthodox did under *Valens*, *Constantine*, *Theodosius junior*, *Anastasiu*, *Philippicus*, &c.

2. They may defend it by proving, that there is a God, who is supreme, and that there is no power but of him, and none against him;

him; and that man is not God, and therefore hath no power but limited; and that to disobey usurpation, is not to disobey power; and that God must be obeyed before man.

3. This is high language, and harsh to Protestant and Christian ears. What! are you serious? Must none in *Rome, Italy, Spain, France, &c.* practise contrary to their Governours? nor in *Turkey* neither? Nor in *China, Japan, &c.*? Is it unlawful to read the Scripture, to pray, to worship God, to be baptized, to profess our selves Christians, to speak a good word, or do a good deed, to feed our Children, or relieve our Parents, &c. if Governours forbid us? This is far worse than to forbid the Scripture in a known tongue, if when we know it, we must not obey it if Governours forbid us, nor so much as plead *Divine Authority* for doing what Gods word commandeth us? Is Gods authority so contemptible in comparison of Prelates. Or doth it so little concern us, as that we may not so much as plead it for any practise forbidden us by superiours? This Doctrine must needs startle a Christians heart. It's far unlike Bishop *Bilsons* of subjection, and such others. If you really mean so, that whatever God commandeth us in Scripture, we must do none of it if the Governours forbid us; or else we overthrow all Governments, speak it out, and prove it; but Christians will abhor it. And yet this same man calleth the Martyrs Saints, when his argument makes them rebels. *W. Johnson* would not have talked at this rate.

9. 51. And I would fain know, whether he that first saith, that it subverteth all Government, and after nameth [supreme Church-Government] do really mean it of all, or of *Church-Government* only?

1. If of all, the man is no Papist, I will gratifie him to proclaim it; for he is no Christian. He that thinks that men must not plead Gods Authority for doing any thing different from the wills of *Turkish, Jewish, or Heathen* Governours, surely is no Christian: No, nor if he had confined this power to Christian Governours.

2. But if he meant it only of *Church-Governours*, how come they to have so absolute a power more than Civil Magistrates? May we plead Gods Authority against a King, and not against the Prelates? What proof was ever given of this? Then the Prelates is far above the Kings: Then the Prelate is an absolute Governour of the King himself.

Let

Let Kings and Parliaments but understand these men, and we fear not their deceits. Are they willing to give over all worship of God, and confessing Christ, and all duties of Religion, Justice, or Charity, if the *supreme Clergy* will but forbid them? See I beseech you, worthy Country-men, what sort of men and Doctrine you have to do with.

§. 52. And why doth the man talk only against *different practice*? Doth he not know, that Government *commandeth duty, as well as forbiddeth the contrary*? Is not *Omission* against Government as well as *Commission*? If the King command Taxes, Military service, &c. may we disobey, and call it *Passive obedience*? What if the Bishops only forbid us to confess Christ, to come to Church, to Pray, to give Alms, to do any good? May we forbear, sobeit we do not the contrary? Doubtless if Gods Word and Authority may not be pleaded for any duty which God commandeth, and the Prelates forbid, neither may it be pleaded for the Omission of any Villany commanded by Prelates (no, not Inquisition, Torments, or Massacres), which God forbids. But this man hath the Gramatical skill to call *Omissive obedience* by the name of *Passive*.

§. 53. It's like he will next say, that *I make odious suppositions, That the supreme Church-power may command any Villanies, and forbid Christian duties.*

Ans. 1. I despair of getting any of these designers to tell me, which is the Supreme Universal Church-power, so as to be well understood. I never heard of any pretenders but Pope, and General Councils, and as Bishop *Guning* holds, the Colledg of all the Bishops in the world. And certainly Pope and Councils have set up Heresies, and decreed even the exterminating of all that will not dis-believe all their senses, and deny Bread to be Bread, and Wine to be Wine. They have decreed deposing Kings, absolving Subjects from their Allegiance, adoring Images, &c. And what is it that yet they may not do? If they say with *Peter*, *If all men deny thee, I will not*; how shall I know that they say true? Doth not the Church of *England* tell us, that Councils have erred, &c?

§. 54. And be not these very honest Sons of the Church of England, that affirm it *irreconcilable to Government, to alledg Divine Authority of any different practises*, without exception, and at the same time to Subscribe to *Art. 21. 19. 6. 18. of the Sufficiency of Scripture. That the Churches of Jerusalem, Alexandria, Antioch, Rome, have erred in matters of Faith; That the Church may not Ordain any thing contrary to Gods Written Word: That General Councils may err, and have erred; and that things Ordained by them, as necessary to Salvation, have neither strength, nor Authority, unless it may be declared, that they are taken out of the holy Scripture: And those are accursed that presume to say, that every man may be saved by the Law, or Sect which he professeth. And why not, if he must do all that the Governours require, or nothing divers to them?*

§. 55. My Reason forbids me to trace such a Writer as this any further. To tell men of every vain Harangue, and confident discourse, that's full of gross error, or false report, is work unworthy of time and labour; but I will a little more open the Coar of his deceit.

C H A P. V.

Wherein Mr. Dodwell's deceits, and the danger of them do consist.

§. 1. **A**S to his Method of disputing, that you may detect his fallacies, he hath got this absurd pretence, *p. 90. That there is but one sense of all Terms, which Causes oblige men to mean; and that every one ought to know, who pretends to have skill in Causes.*

Ans. Would you have thought that ever a man should publicly use such a *Cothurnus* among the Learned? What a man is obliged to mean, is one thing, and what he *doth mean* is another. And is there any one that knoweth what humane Language is, that knoweth not that almost all words have various signi-

significations? Doth he not know by how good reason the Schools oblige Disputants, first to explain their Terms? And what need there is of Definition to explain them? He instanceth in the words *Bishops, and the Church of England*; And might have added, *the Catholick Church*. And doth he not know that it is the *species* of Bishops that we differ about? and will the general name here explain each parties sense? When we are for one sort of Bishops, and against another? And is it not such fraud as souls should not be abused by, to refuse wilfully to *define* the Episcopacy that he meaneth, and then plead that all should understand him? And why is it not as much ignorance in him not to understand me, as in me not to understand him, when I use distinct explication, which he obstinately refuseth?

And doth not Dr. *Stillingfleet's* case shame what he saith of the *Church of England*, who was hardly brought to explain it, and at last denieth the very being of the Church in Mr. *Dodwell's* sense? which of you was to blame to meddle with the Word till you had skill in *Causēs*, to understand it without a Definition?

And doth not Dr. *Stillingfleet* take it as the Introduction of Popery, to hold a Constitutive Regent Church-Government, National, or Catholick? and so he, and Mr. *Dodwell* mean not the same thing by the *Church Catholick* (nor Bishop *Gunning*, Mr. *Thorndike*, or the Church of *Rome*, who are all for an Universal humane Supreme power). And who is he that hath read Dr. *Challoners Credo Eccles. Cathol.* *Chillingworth*, Bishop *Mortons Grand Imposition*, Bishop *Bilson*, Dr. *White*, Dr. *Whitaker*, Dr. *Sutcliffe*, Bishop *Andrews*, Bishop *Carlson*, &c. *Chamier*, *Sadeel*, *Melancthon*, *Bucer*, &c. who knoweth not that the Papists and Protestants, by the name of the *Catholick Church*, do mean several things, and that we deny the very being of any such Church as they call the *Catholick*? And is this the bold and happy Disputant, that will save the Schools and World the labour of *explaining Terms*, and *foreagreeing of the sense*, and put men on disputing, where the Subject is denied, and fill a Book with tedious confident Harangues, and then hide all the fraud by saying, that *there is but one sense of all Terms, which Causes obligem. n. to mean; and that every one ought to know, who pretend to have skill in Causēs*? When the Cause disputed is only managed by words, as they signify the minds of the Speakers about the real matters.

§. 2. And as to the material fundamental difference between Mr. *Dodwell's* party and us, it lyeth in these following things :

I. We totally differ about the nature of Gods Government of man.

II. And about the use of the Holy Scripture, and Gods Laws.

III. About the nature and extent of all humane Government.

IV. About the form of moral good and evil.

V. About the essential form of the Catholick Church.

VI. About Gods ordinary means of saving Grace.

VII. About the use of Preaching.

VIII. About the duty of worshipping God in Sacred Assemblies, or the Communion of Saints.

IX. About the difference of Apostles, and the office of the Bishops.

X. About the office of a Presbyter or Parish-Pastor.

XI. About the Necessaries to Ministry, Churches, Christianity, and ordinary *title* to Salvation.

XII. And about the final Judgment. If all these be little tollerable differences, why may not we be tollerated ? If not, judg Reader who they be that are intollerable, when you hear them plead against tolleration.

§. 3. I. For the first, we judg that there is a God, who is the Governour of the World by an universal Law, which is above all humane Laws or will, and that he is the fountain of all power, and there is none but what he giveth and limiteth, and that no man is above him, nor hath true authority against his Laws.

But Mr. *Dodwell* saith, *That it is irreconcilable to Government in this life, or to due subordination of subjects to superiours, to practice differently, and defend it by pretending Divine authority, and appealing to writings,* (Scriptures is our word by excellency so called). And so God shall be God, and be obeyed, if the Clergy please.

§. 4. II. As to the second, we suppose that the Holy Scriptures are Gods Laws, indited and recorded by the Holy Ghost to be the first obliging Rule of Faith, and holy living, which all men are to be obedient to, before and against all contrary Laws of men. But Mr. *Dodwell* as aforesaid, alloweth no such prime obligation as will warrant an appeal to the Word of God, from the visible Church-Governours that contradict it.

§. 5. III. And for the third, we suppose that all humane Powers are derived from God, and have no authority but what he giveth them, and are more under him and his Laws, than the Justices are under the King and his Laws, and can oblige no man against the Laws of God. But how far Mr. *Dodwell* thinks otherwise, you have heard. He saith not indeed that *we must break Gods Laws, but we must not pretend them, or appeal to them against our Governours*. In charity I hope he meaneth no worse, but that we must take our Rulers word or exposition, and judg nothing to be in the Scripture, contrary to their commands. And whether he give them the same dominion also over the Law of Nature, let him tell you. *Paul* disclaimed dominion over mens faith, and the written Law of God.

§. 6. IV. And for the fourth, *We take moral good to be a conformity to Gods Law, and moral evil or sin to be a breach of it*. But Mr. *Dodwell* is for measuring them by the Clergies or Governours will, though Gods Law be against theirs.

§. 7. V. And for the fifth, we take the Catholick Church to have no Supreme Government but God, and our Glorified Redeemer God and man; and that there is no such thing as a Catholick Church of Gods making under any other Supreme Rulers. But that as God is the invisible King of this visible world, and Kings are subordinate Supremes in their Kingdom, but neither one of them, or many conjunct in an Aristocracy, Supreme over all the earth; so Christ is the partly visible, and partly invisible supreme Ruler of the visible Church of Christians, and each Pastor is under him over his proper flock (bound to keep concord and peace); but none under him Supreme over all, whether Monarch (as the Pope) or Aristocracy, as Councils, Cardinals, or others. But Mr. *Dodwell* is for a visible Society, with a visible humane Supreme. But who the Supreme is, I despair of getting him to acquaint us.

§. 8. VI. And for the sixth, we suppose that God sent forth Preachers to convert the world, and turn them from darkness to light, and the power of Satan to God, and that faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word preached, and that whoever believeth shall be saved; and the word of God is powerful to this end, and sufficient to make us wise to salvation. But Mr. *Dodwell* thinks that

that it is not Preaching, but the delivering men the Sacraments, that giveth them the first true saving grace and title to Salvation. And that none in the world have this Sacrament or Covenant-title to life, but those that receive it from a hand that had an Ordination by Bishops in his sense, of uninterrupted succession from the Apostles by the like Ordination.

§. 8. VII. Accordingly we hold that Preaching is for the converting of souls, and the means of saving faith and holiness. But what he thinks it is good for, I know not well; nor whether he would send the *Indians* the Sacraments instead of Preachers.

§. 10. VIII. We take it to be our duty, though men forbid us, to confess Christ, and assemble for Gods worship, to read and hear the Scripture, and to praise God: But he thinks we must not practice differently from the ruling Clergies will, if they forbid us, nor alledge Divine authority for it.

• §. 11. IX. We suppose that the office of a *Prophetical Ministry* bringing new Doctrines or Laws from God, and the office of the *Teachers* and *Rulers* by these Laws, are greatly different, and must necessarily be distinguished. *Moses* was a *Prophetical Mediator* in *Legislation*, and he confirmed his Mediation by uncontrouled Miracles. The Prophets afterward came but on particular applicatory messages. But the Priests and Levites as such were no Prophets, nor had power to make any new additions or alterations of the Law, but only to teach it the people, and as guides apply it to their several cases; so Christ and his Apostles commissioned to deliver and record all his Doctrines and Commands to the following ages, did by the Holy Ghost Prophetically deliver to the world that body of Doctrine and Law, which must rule them to the end, and judg them; and thus sealed and confirmed all by a multitude of uncontrouled Miracles; but all following Bishops and Pastors are not to do the like, nor add or alter, nor are such Legislators, being not Prophets nor workers of Miracles, but only to teach and apply the Laws already recorded in Scripture, and guide their Congregations in variable circumstances (time, place, translations, &c.) according to the general rules of Gods Law. This is the truth.

But how much Mr. *Dodwell* equals the Bishops and Apostles, and sets their words above the Scripture as to obligation, you have seen before.

§. 12. X. And as he giveth Bishops power to silence Presbyters, and forbid the Preaching of the Gospel, and Gods worship, so how little *knowledge* or *godliness*, or *common sobriety* or *honesty*, he requireth to a saving Sacramenting Priest, who must not be separated from, you heard before, contrary to *Cyprian*, and many a Councils Canons. But we know that *Paul* had no power to destruction, but only to edification. And they have no more.

§. 13. XI. We suppose that we must love, honour, and communicate with all such as true Ministers or Churches, who have true faith and repentance, and sincere obedience to Christs Laws, and are able, godly, willing Pastors, chosen or consented to by the flocks, approved and ordained by senior Pastors, (especially in Synods where City-Pastors preside), and especially if also authorized by the Christian Magistrate.) But he thinks if they have not also successive Ordination from the Apostles by Bishops of his *species*, they are no Ministers, or Churches, and have no Sacrament, and Covenant title to Salvation, but are Schismatics, and by their Ministry sin against the Holy Ghost. And so destroyeth all certainty of title to Salvation, and of Church-communion, Ministry and Sacraments, to all the Christian World.

§. 14. XII. Lastly, we think that men shall be judged by their keeping or breaking Gods Law, and according to what they did in the body. But he would have us obey the Supreme Clergy, and not plead Scripture or Divine authority for our different practice; because the *Government that lasteth but for this life, ought not to admit of disputes more lasting than its practice.*

§. 15. I conclude with a request to him to resolve me these doubts.

1. Whether Prophets having immediate messages from Heaven, were not differenced from the teaching Priests and Pastors.

2. Whether false Prophets were not grievously threatened among the *Jews*; and whether Christ did not command us to beware of false Prophets?

3. Whether he be not a false Prophet (worse than a false teacher) that falsely pretendeth to that which is proper to a Prophet?

4. Whether it be not proper to a Prophet to deliver as immediately

diately from God, new Laws to the universal Church, yea or to any Church, which are not in the Scripture, nor are revealed by it as Gods means, (besides the determination of circumstances left to humane prudence variable *pro re nata*) if *Moses* and the *Apostles* in Legislation acted as Prophets, do not they so that pretend to do the like?

5. Whether the General Councils of Bishops and the Pope have not done the work proper to the Prophetical office, when they have made Laws for the universal Church, and this as by Divine authority, and undertaken to give all the Church the sense of Scripture, which only shall be obligatory to them thereby? For it is the maker of the sense that is the maker of the Law; especially when they pretend to Infallibility, or to be secured from erring in faith, by Divine inspiration, how ignorant or bad soever they be singly. Is not this pretended *authority* and *inspiration* that of Prophets, as different from meer Teachers and Guides by Gods Law already made?

6. If it be so, how many such Papal Councils, arrogating such power, have been false Prophets?

7. But if they pretend not Inspiration, nor Prophetical authority from God, nor yet authority given them by the Scriptures, or Laws of God already made, (or falsely pretend such) then is not this to usurp *Christs own authority*, and so instead of being false Prophets, to be partly *Vice-Christ*s, (or Law-givers to his universal Church) called commonly *Antichrist*s? I would willingly have things so cleared, that men may be freed from all such suspicions.

But if you are still confident that the universal Church hath a visible supreme Government besides Christ, I should be glad, 1. To see it proved. 2. To know whose it is, and how we may know them. 3. And to know its true extent. If you intend no fraud, you cannot refuse me this, when I promise you, if performed, I will let fall the suit, and no more trouble you with lesser Controversies.

I have

I have no Copy of my first Letter to Mr. *Dodwell* upon a Book which he sent me. This is his Answer.

Reverend and Worthy Sir,

I Have received your very kind Letter, wherein I hardly know whether I should be more thankful for your approbation or your reproof, both of them being in their kind so useful, and both of them being by you performed with so great civility. I am confident that if our modern disputes had been moderated with that candor, men would certainly have been more peaceful, and very Orthodox, than now we find them. I could very heartily have wished that the opinions wherein we differ, had not been of that nature as to separate Communion, (for this I look upon as the only circumstance that can make such differences grievous to a pious person; for as for those others which exasperate many, that Dissenters are not so wise to discern the truth, or so fortunate in avoiding prejudices, or lighting on faithful informations in a time when they are capable of receiving them; or that they are not so submissive as themselves expect to that Pope which *Luther* has long since observed in every mans heart, &c. are reasons either sinful, or at least insufficient to excuse the sin of uncharitableness upon such an account) but as they are, considering them as tempered with that piety and moderation which may expiate their other malignities, that they are rather alledged as Apologies for your selves, than as obligations on others, rather to excuse your deformity in assisting at our Altars, than erecting others in opposition to them; that you are still inquisitive and desirous of further information, and ready to lay down your mistakes where you are convinced that they are such; that still you preserve a peaceable mind, and embrace our Communion it self in *voto*, though perhaps not actually; these are so valuable considerations, even before God as well as man, for excusing from the guilt of error, as that whatever I may think of your opinions, I hope it shall not hinder me from a cordial respect and veneration for your person.

As I do very much esteem the good opinion of so great a lover of peace and piety as your self, and should have been sorry to have given any just occasion of offence to you; so I am not a little glad that upon a review of the particulars mentioned in your Letter, I find my self so very innocent. For as for my Preface, the main parts

of

of it wherein the disrepect of the Clergy is shewn to have been an Introductory to the Atheism of the age we live in ; and that the Conformable Clergy, that is, such as would answer the design of the Church not only as to their exterior demeanor in publick solemn Assemblies, but also as to the qualifications of their persons, and the conduct of their whole lives, could not prove either trifling in their Preaching or scandalous in their examples, and therefore that the Church is not responsible for their misdemeanors where they prove otherwise ; and that the Laity are in their proportion obliged to the same duties with the Clergy, and therefore may make use of the advices there prescribed ; or where the errors of our modern School-Divinity are touched, and some Proposals made for their reformation ; in these things, I say, I can see no occasion of offence, but rather some preservatives against it. The only thing I suppose you aim at, is my taxing some opinions of Nonconformists, and that with as little personal reflection as I was able, which I conceived prejudicial to Church-authority ; which because you seem to disown, I do not see why you should apprehend your self as particularly concerned, especially there being nothing in the discourse whereby you could conclude either your self or any of your moderate temper to have been intended. I will assure you I intended none but such as were guilty, and with being so, I charged none particularly. But that not only the old Puritans and Separatists of *Queen Elizabeths* times, &c. but also very many of ours now are guilty of them, is too notorious to suppose you ignorant of it. I could heartily wish that the number of better principled and more peaceable dissenters were greater than I fear it is. Nor do I see that what is there said can make it unuseful even to the persons truly concerned, that value truth more than any, however beloved party ; seeing it may either let them see the ill consequence of their Principles, and their influence on that Atheism and Prophaneness which I am confident themselves do most cordially detest, which I conceive to be more likely to prevail with them than other arguments, as being more suited to their pious dispositions ; or supposing that my fears were indeed groundless of the introduction of prophaneness by the contempt of Government, or of contempt of Government by their disobedience to it, yet might it at least warn them from confining on such dangerous consequences, or from coming to them unawares by an abuse of Principles generally true, but obnoxious to particular inconveniences when

when unwarily managed. I mean it may put them in mind of the greater momentousness of good Government and peace than many of their differences, and consequently of the great engagements incumbent on them for their preservation; and that they would therefore so take care to oppose the particular abusive Constitutions of Government, as not to bring their Government into contempt, nor to suggest unanswerable Apologies to factious persons for the future, when they are unwilling to be obedient. These are abuses which I believe your self would wish redressed in the Causes of our Church-divisions. But if it could not be useful to them, yet could it not be prejudicial to them, nothing being urged, either invidiously, or imperiously, and therefore no harm being done if I should prove utterly mistaken.

That you should marvel how Reviving Discipline could by me be expected from the constitution of our present Ecclesiastical Government, does seem no less marvellous to me, especially as to the exception you make against it; for if it were impossible to maintain Discipline under a Government so far Monarchical, as to appropriate the Decretory power of the Government of many to a single person, though the execution be intrusted to many; then it would follow, that the secular Discipline under a secular Monarch of any extent, were impossible also to be observed, seeing it is as impossible for any such Prince to have a particular cognizance of every particular Cause, much more of every particular person in his Dominions, as for a Bishop in his Diocese. As there it appears by experience (I shall instance in a Scripture-example, because I know that will be liable to least exception), that *David* in an extent more vast, and a people more numerous than that of the largest Dioceses, 120. Miles in length, and 60. Miles in breadth, and rather better in *David's* days, where were accounted 1300000 men fit for War, besides *Artificers*, and such others, not coming under that account, was yet able to give a good account of his Government, without particular inspection into all Causes, or Communication of his power to numerous co-ordinate Presbyteries; so I do not see, why it may not as well hold for a possibility of Discipline, under an Ecclesiastical Monarch of a much narrower extent; for the reason produced by you, seems to proceed from the nature of Government in general, and therefore must proceed with the same force in seculars as Ecclesiasticals, there being no ingredi-

ent peculiarly relating to Religion, much less to Christianity, which might alter the case, or argue a disparity; for certainly Princes, as well as Bishops, are responsible for the miscarriage of their particular Subjects; for they may be prevented by moral diligence, and yet you will not thence conclude that every particular must come under his immediate personal care and cognizance; nor is it proved, that the Bishop is otherwise obliged to such a care upon peculiar respects. Besides, that it is plainly against experience, even in Ecclesiasticals; for as it has fallen out in some places, where there were many Cities, the Bishops were proportionally multiplied, as in *Africa* and *Ireland*; so that it was not upon account of the impossibility of managing the charge of much greater multitudes than the Inhabitants of those small Cities, appears, in that even in the very same places the greatness of no City was thought sufficient for multiplying the Bishops, though it was for the Inferior Clergy. I need not tell you how great *Rome* was, and how full of Christians, even in *Decius's* time, under *Cornelius*, which required the united endeavours of above a Thousand Clergies, as appears from the said *Cornelius's* Epistle to *Fabius*, of *Antioch*, in *Euseb.* yet was one Bishop thought sufficient for all; nay, the erecting another in the same See, was thought to be formal Schism, as appears from the controversies of those Ages, betwixt *Cornelius*, and *Novatian*, and *St. Cyprian*, and *Felicissimus*. The same also might have been shewn in several other Cities, exceeding numerous, and abounding with Christians, as *Antioch*, and *Alexandria*, and *Carthage*, &c. which even in those early Ages, when Discipline was at the greatest Rigour, were yet Governed by single Bishops: Nay, whole Nations were sometimes Governed only by one, as the *Goths* by *Ulpian*, and the *Indians* by *Edebus*, and the *Arabians* by *Moses*, which is an Argument insisted on by some Presbyterians, for shewing the probability of Ordinations by bare Presbyters. Yet are there no complaints of dissolution of Discipline in such places, upon account of the greatness of their charge, which to me seem sufficient convictions; that the multitude of persons governed, is not the reason of our present neglects in that particular.

When I said, that *Ignatius's* Epistles were questioned by the Presbyterians, I never said, nor intended it concerning all (for I knew of *Vedelius's* Apology for them), much less did I lay it

particularly to your charge; so that if you had here forbore assuming to your self what was spoken of others, many of whose Opinions I am confident you will not undertake to justify, there had been no occasion of this exception. That other Presbyterians, and those by far the greatest number, have denied them, cannot be questioned.

As for the Reasons for Nonconformity alledged by you, and your Brethren, of the *Savoy*-Conference in 1660. if I might without offence, presume to interpose my own thoughts, they are as followeth: 1. For the approving, not only submitting to such things as you disliked, and that by an Oath, I am sure there are many Conformists themselves, that understand no more to have been intended by the Church, but only an Exterior submission, not an Internal Approbation of the Particulars. And particularly, I have been informed by a Letter from a very worthy credible person, who pretends to have had it from the Bishop himself, that Bishop *Sanderson*, who was a Member of your Conference, interposed those words in the Act of Parliament, where it is required, that Ministers declare their *unfeigned assent and consent to the use of all things* in the Book of Common-Prayer, &c. designedly that this Objection might be prevented. The new Article of Faith, inserted in the Rubrick, I do not know, nor can I now get the Books that past betwixt you at the Conference, to find what you mean. That Lay-Chancellors were put down, and that the Bishops did more consult their Presbyteries, I could for my own part heartily wish. But I cannot think abuses momentous enough to warrant a Schism; and I know your self are for bearing with some things that are not so well liked of, rather than that the Church of God should be divided for them. In brief, I do not understand any of the Six Particulars mentioned as the Reasons that keep you off, though indeed you disapprove them, both because you do not undertake to determine what they might be to others, but only what they are to persons of your mind (though I confess, this may be understood as a modest declining to judge of others); and because you conceive plenty the most likely means to unite us, which could not be if we imposed any thing on you against your Consciences. So that the only one may be presumed to have been thought sufficient by you to this purpose, seems to have been another, which because you intimate somewhat obscurely, I do not know whether you would be

be willing that it should be taken notice of. But however I suppose that it self does I suppose only deprive us of your Clerical, not your Laical Communion. God give us all to discern the things that belong to peace. As for other Questions, we may patiently await our Lords leisure, who when he comes shall tell us all things; and in the mean-time preserve Charity, and be wise unto sobriety. I hope, Sir, you will excuse my freedom, and let me know whether I may in any thing be serviceable to you; and above all things reserve a portion in your Prayers for

*Trin. Col. near Dublin,
Decemb. 14. 1672.*

Your unfeigned Well-wisher,

HENRY DODWELL.

*For the Worthy and much Honoured Mr. Henry Dodwell,
at Trinity Colledg near Dublin in Ireland.*

Worthy Sir,

I Heartily thank you for your patience with my free expressions, and for your grave and kind reply. As to the main cause of the *Nonconformists*, should I enter upon that which I cannot prosecute, I should greatly injure it, my self and you: I must again crave your patience with my freedom. The sins which they fear (whether justly is the question) are so heinous, that they dare not mention them, lest their condemners and afflictors cannot bear it; and so many, that to open them justly, will require a great Volume, and therefore not by me to be done in a Letter. Only to what you have said, let me mind you in *transitu*.

1. That you mistake me if you think that I excepted against your Preface as meddling with me, any otherwise than as I am one of those *Nonconformists* with whom I am acquainted, who are mostly of my mind. (And I suppose you would take it for no honour to be thought to be better acquainted with the most of them in *England*, than I am.)

2. That your intimations about the old *Nonconformists* are not to our business, seeing the name of *Nonconformists* maketh

not, nor proveth all or many so named to be of the same mind. Nor is your mention of our Treaty or Papers of 1660, more pertinent, it being the old Cause only that we had to do with, the new Laws of Conformity being not then existent, which have made it quite another thing. Only I assure you, if my superiours would not take it for a crime and injury to do what *Justin, Tertullian*, &c. did to Heathens, even Apologize for their mistaken Cause), and if the Presb were open to divulge it, I would endeavour to shew another face of Conformity, and Nonconformity, than is commonly taken notice of; and also to give you (who so well understand Antiquity) most full and palpable evidence of our Conformity to the ancient Churches, at least for 300, and mostly for 600 years after Christ. But (that I may not say nothing to you) I shall only employ these lines about your suggestions concerning the possibility of true Discipline by *Diocesans as they are with us*. And still you must pardon my freedom of speech. I must say, that it is the calamity of Churches, when their Prelates and Pastors are men that never were acquainted with the flocks, but spend one half of their days in Schools and Colledges, and the other in Noblemens or Gentlemens houses, and then talk confidently of the poor people whom they know not, and the *Discipline* which they never tried. Even you whom I honour as a person of extraordinary worth, constrain me by this your Letter to think that I dispute as about war with one that never stormed a Garison, nor fought a battel; or as about Navigation with one that was never one month at sea.

I. Our first question is, *What the Pastoral Office is*, and especially *Discipline*?

II. Our next is, Whether it may be delegated to, or done by one that is not of Gods Institution for the doing of it.

III. And then we shall soon see whether it be possible for our *Diocesans* to do it, or any considerable part of it?

I. If the *Erafsians* be in the right, that none of our Discipline is necessary besides that by the Sword, (and our Preaching) then we may put up the Controversie on both sides. But if that be the work of Bishops now, which was so in Scripture-times, the matter will hold no long dispute. To shorten that work, I desire you to peruse (its like you have done) Dr. *Hammonds* Paraphrase on all the Texts that mention Bishops and Pres-

Presbyters, with his Treatise of the Keys, where he will tell you, that it was the Bishops Office to be the ordinary Preacher, to Pray, to celebrate the Eucharist, to visit the Sick, to keep and distribute the alms and offerings of the Church, as Curators for the Poor, with much more work. And that every single Congregation had such a Bishop, that ever met to celebrate Gods publick Worship; and that there was not a meeting of a Christian Church without such (for the said Worship in Scripture-times) for he saith that there is no proof that there were any other Presbyters in Scripture-times.

And for *Discipline*, it is past doubt: 1. That as to the matter of it, it must consist of a personal watch over each member of the flock; that every one in it that liveth in gross sin, or Infidel, or Heathenish, or Heretical error and ignorance, be orderly admonished, first more privately, afterward more openly, and lastly most publicly; and that he be by convincing reasons and exhortations perswaded to repentance. That the penitent must be comforted and confirmed, the obstinately impenitent rejected, as unmeet for the Communion of the Church. And for the manner, it is agreed that it must be done with condescending tenderness, patience, plain evidence, earnest exhortations, no means left untried to reduce a sinful miserable soul. And all this with the time and patience which so great a work requireth. (And sure if the Congregation must avoid the sinner, they should know why.) One such person will hold the Pastor work from first to last many an hour and day.

Next, let us think how many such as by Christs Law must be thus dealt with, are in a Diocess. I had the most reformed people (as to sins of commission and omission) that ever I knew in *England*. Our custom being to have each family come by turns to us to be personally Catechised and instructed. I had full opportunity to know them all. Many score of them that came daily to Church, knew not the Essentials of Christianity and Baptism. When I came first to them, I suppose some thousands lived in gross ignorance, open impiety and prophaneness. And even at last some scores I fear lived in gross sin. Some were notorious drunkards, raging weekly twice or thrice in the open streets. Some quieter drunkards. Many profane Swearers. Too many railers, fighters, slanderers, &c. Three or four Apostate-Infidels. The Parishes about me were far worse. A great part of the

the people know not who Christ is, nor what he doth, as the Saviour of the world, nor understand one of many Articles of the Creed, or Petitions of the Lords Prayer; much less do any thing like Christians for Children or Servants in their Families.

The Diocess that I now live in, hath above 1100 Parishes, some have half as many; some Parishes have 3000, some 10000 People. in *London* some 20000, 30000, and the Country smaller Parishes usually about 400, 500, or 1000. I do warrantably conjecture that in the Diocess where I now live, there may be about 50000 souls that by Christs Law should be admonished and disciplined for gross sin. And about 80000, or 100000 that are grossly ignorant of Christianity. It's ten to one (experience tells it me) that five Conventions will scarce serve with each obstinate sinner, to bring the work to the issue of a due Excommunication or Absolution. Some parts of the Diocess that I am in, are about 120 miles from other parts. The Diocesan then that doth all this himself, (but there is no such) if he sit half the year, must either speak to 10000, or 20000 persons at once, or in a few minutes, or else he must let all the rest lye and rot in their sins, till he hath done with the first. And indeed (I have tried it) a sober Pastoral course of conviction and discipline with each one, will take up so much time, that seven years are not enough for him to go over all this Diocess if he did as much in a month as ever I knew a Bishop do in his life, except against Godly Nonconformists, or Conscientious Dissenters.

But if you consider how far every accusing Minister and Churchwarden, and every accused sinner, have to travel, some 20, some 40 miles, &c.) and that Witnesses also must travel as far; and how long they must attend, and how few can bear the charge of this; and that the old and weak sort of sinners are unable for the journey, and who shall do the Parish Ministers work the while; and how likely it is that of 10000 such sinners, 5000 may be dead, or the Witnesses at least, before the rest are tried and well dispatched; or the case grown old, and the same men drunken twenty times again, before he can be judged for the first. And also how strange a course this is to humble, convince, and save a soul——wonderful!——that it should with any man living be a controversy, Whether

one Bishop be sufficient for all this? And what need we more than common experience? The work is every where undone. Lay the blame where you will, not one common gross sinner of a thousand is disciplin'd or judged as in question. That which can be done, and should be done, some one good Bishop will do. But none that ever I knew did ever see the face, and speak to one of a thousand gross sinners of his Diocese, (unless perhaps as he preached to one or few Congregations) nor do I know any that take it for their work, (if they could do it), but leave it to the Lay-Chancellor as his part.

If you say that Excommunication must not be on many : I answer,

1. The Bishops trying and conviction of gross sinners is first for their Repentance, and not their Excommunication, except in case of the last obstinacy, which cannot be foreknown till tried.

2. If Christ would not have such Discipline at all, these needs no Bishop to do it. If he would, when twenty drunkards, fornicators, &c. are notoriously guilty, is it his will that one of these only be admonished, convinced, excommunicated, and all the rest let alone that are equally guilty? Sure the Law of God doth not so distinguish, but say of all alike, *If any called a brother be a fornicator, &c.* And will such partiality either reform men, or honour Religion, or rather make it a scorn, and make him that is singled out, hate the partial Prosecutor.

If you say it's long of Churchwardens that accuse not men : I answer,

1. And it will be so, while the thing is unseizable; who will be hated to do no good?

2. Some Churchwardens of late to some Articles have presented all the Parish without exception. And so no man heard of it any more.

II. And whether the Bishop may delegate his Office, or do his work *per alios*, would be no controversy if Scripture were our Rule, or it were known what a Pastors office is. If he may delegate it, either to a Layman in *sensu composito*, or to a Clergy man: If to a Layman, than a Layman and a Clergy man are all one. For there is nothing but the work to define the authority and obligation by, which constituteth the Office. A Bishop is one authorized and obliged to do the work of a Bishop, and

and so is a **Layman** too by this supposition. If to a Clergyman, either to one of the same order and office with the Bishop, or of another. If of the same (before or now made so) *datur quæsum*, then he is not the sole Bishop. If of another *in sensu composito*, then another Clergy man is not another; For he that is Authorized to the same work, is of the same Office.

If you say that he may not delegate the whole work, *de specie*, but a part; I ask which part? either the Essential part, or but an Integral common part. If the former? 1. Either to such as God in Scripture by office authorizeth to that part, or not. If the former, then the Bishop cometh too late to that which God hath done already. And then that is no proper work of Bishops which God hath made common to another Office. If the later, then a man may make new Priestly Offices and Orders, even to the same work that God hath made Officers to do already. And then we need not say, [that Orders *carè Jure Divino*] if the Bishop may make more at his pleasure; but *quo jure*; and what shall set his bounds and end? This seemeth more (in kind) than the *Italians* at *Trent* would have given to the Pope over Bishops. And if they do not themselves also that same Essential part of their Office which they give to others, they degrade themselves. For the ceasing or alienation of an Essential part, changeth the *species*.

But I suppose you will say it is Presbyters to whom they may delegate this work. And if so, either it is a work which God hath made part of the Presbyters Office, or not. If it be, then that Presbyter doth his own work appointed him by God, and not another mans. If not, then he maketh a new Officer, who is neither Bishop nor Presbyter.

But the Nature of the Office sheweth, that it may not be delegated (though a Bishop may Ordain men to an Office of Gods making, and the King or Church may make new Officers *circa sacra*, as Church-Wardens, Clock keepers, Ostiaries, &c.); for it is [an Authority, and obligation to personal duty, to be done by personal ability] as is the Office of a Physician, a Judge, a School-Master, a Pilot, &c. where he that Authorizeth and obligeth another stately to do his work, doth thereby make that other a Physician, Judge, School-Master, Pilot, &c. This is but Ordination.

And if a Bishop be but one that may appoint others to do the

the Episcopal work, then 1. Why is not every King a Bishop, for he may appoint men to do a Bishops work? And why is he not also a Physician, Musician, Pilot, &c. because he may do the like by them? 2. And then the Bishop appointed by the King, is no more a Bishop indeed than one appointed by a Bishop is.

But this delegation that I speak against, is a smaller sin than such men choole. To depute others to exercise Discipline, whom God appointed not *de specie* thereto, is but Sacriledge and Usurpation, (by alienating it from the true office, and setting up a false one): But yet the thing might some how be done, if any were to do it. But the almost total deposition and destruction of the Discipline it self, and letting none do it, by pretending the sole authority of doing it, is another kind of sin.

Now to your answer from the similitude of Civil Monarchs, I reply, It is no wonder if we never agree about Church-offices, if we no better agree of the general nature of them, and their work. Of which if you will please to read a sheet or two which I wrote the last year to *Ludov. Molinaus*, of the difference of Magistracy, and Church-power, and also read the Lord *Bacons* Considerations, you will excuse me for here passing by what is there said.

I. The standing of the Magistrates Office is by the Law of Nature, which therefore alloweth variety and mutations of inferior Orders, as there is cause. But the standing of the Clergy is by Supernatural Institution. Our Book of Ordination saith there are three Orders, &c. Therefore man may not alter them, or make more of that same kind.

II. Kingly power requireth not *ad dispositionem materiae*, such Personal ability as the Pastoral-office doth. A child may be a King, and it may serve turn if he be but the head of power, and give others commission to do all the rest of the Governing work. But it is not so with a Judge, a Physician, an Orator, or a Bishop; who is not *subiectum capax* of the essence of the office, without personal aptitude.

III. God hath described the Bishops office in Scripture as consisting of three parts, *viz.* Teaching, Priestly, (or about Worship and Sacraments) and ruling; as under Christs Prophetical, Priestly and Kingly Office. And he hath no where made one

more proper to a Bishop than another; nor said this is Essential; and that is but Integral. Therefore the Bishop may as well allow a Layman to administer the Sacraments, &c. as one not appointed to it by God, to Rule by the Keys.

IV. The Bishops Pastoral Rule is only by Gods word upon the Conscience (as Bishop *Bilson* of *Obed.* sheweth at large, and all Protestants agree), and not by any mulcts or corporal force. If he use the sword, or constraint, it is not as a Bishop, but as a Magistrate. But the Kings is by the sword. And will it follow that because the King may appoint another to apprehend men, and carry them to prison, &c. that therefore a Bishop appointed by God to Preach, Worship and Rule, and therein to draw the Impenitent to Repentance by patient exhortations, and reproofs, &c. may commit this to another, never appointed to it of God?

V. Either it is the Bishops work (as was said) that is delegated by him, or some other. If properly his own, than either he maketh more Bishops, (and that's all we plead for), or else a Presbyter or Layman may do a Bishops proper work. And then what need of a Bishop (to pass by the contradiction.)

VI. But my chief answer to you is, the King as Supreme Magistrate doth appoint and rule by others that are truly Magistrates: They have every one a Judicial power in their several places under him, even every Justice of Peace. But you suppose the Bishop to set up no Bishops, nor no Church-Governours under him at all. A King can rule a Kingdom by Supremo Judgment, when he hath hundreds of Judges under him who do it by his authority. And if this had been all our dispute, whether a Patriarch or Archbishop can rule a thousand Churches by a thousand Inferior Bishops, or Church-rulers, you had said something? But doth it follow that your Church Monarch can over-see them all himself without any sub-overseers, or rule them (by Gods word on the Conscience) without any sub-rulers? You appropriate the Decretory Power to your Monarch; and communicate only the executive. Hold to that. The whole Government is but *Legislatio & Judicium*; Legislation now we meddle not with, (yet our Bishops allow it to the Presbyters in Convocation, for they take Canons to be Church-Laws.) It is a lower power that is denied to them, that they grant the higher to.

to. Bare execution is no Government. A Hangman is no Governour. A Governour may also be Executioner, but a meer Executioner is no Governour. The People are Executioners of Excommunications, while they withdraw from the Excommunicate, and with such do not eat, &c. as 1 Cor. 5. And the Parish-Priest is an Executioner, while he (as a Cryer) proclaimeth or readeth the Chancellors Excommunication in the Church; and when he denieth the Sacrament to those that he is bid deny it to. I grant you that this is Communicated. But it is the Judicial power it self which I have been proving the Bishop incapable of. Exploration is part of the Judicial work. I know you include not that in execution (which follows it) If you did, it would be a sad office for a Bishop to sentence all men, upon other mens trial and word. As if the Bishop must Excommunicate all that some body else saith he must Excommunicate. This turneth Decreeing into a Hangman-like Execution.

And the nature of the cause forbiddeth it. No man is to be Excommunicate for any other crime as such, but for Impenitence in some crime; nor to be absolved after, but upon Repentance. Now if it were, but whether a man *de facto* have been drunk, or fornicated, or perjured, &c. it were hard judging sententially meerly on trust from others; but yet perhaps that might sometimes be done: But when the case is, Whether the man be penitent, Personal trial is necessary to a Rational and Ecclesiastical administration of the sentence. I conclude therefore, that as a King can judg by many hundred Judges, and a General command an Army by many hundred Commanders, but not without any one by himself alone, having Executioners under him. So is it here.

VII. And I pray you note one other difference: In the Kingdom it is not one subject of an hundred, or many hundreds, that hath Law suits with others once in a year, or seven years, or his life. Nor one of some hundreds (where I have lived) that findeth the Magistrate work as Criminal. And in this we differ even from the Physician, who in a City hath not one of many that is sick, but we are all of a sinning corrupt disposition, and the Pastor hath few of his flock that need not some personal applications in one degree or other. And even as to gross sins lived in, and ignorance or heresie against the very essence of Christianity, it is a good Parish where a *considerable* part of it are not guilty;

guilty; so that it is easier for one Justice of Peace to send two or three thieves in a year to a Gaol, and bind two or three to the good behaviour, than for one Bishop to admonish, exhort, convince and judg 10000 impenitent sinners in a little time, and hear all the Witnesses, &c.

If you should have said, that the Parish Priest is to reprove, exhort, convince them first, till he prove them impenitent, and he is to instruct the ignorant, Infidels and Hereticks: I answer, 1. That is more than an executive power. 2. We desire no more at all from Bishops or any, and know no other Episcopal power over the people, but thus *personally to convince men, and declare to the Congregation upon proof, the fitness or unfitness of men for their Communion, by penitence or impenitence.* But this is it that the Ministers are hindred from, or denied. They have no power to speak with any one ignorant, Heretical, Infidel, or scandalous sinner in the Parish, but such as are willing. And few of the guilty are willing. They will neither come to the Minister, nor suffer him to come to them, but shut their doors on him if they know that he cometh on such a work, or else they will not be within. Or if they be, will tell him, that they will not answer him. When I came first to *Kedermister*, the rabble multitude curst me in the streets, and rose up against me, but for saying, That Infants Originally have that sin and misery which needs a Saviour; yet such (if they scorn to speak with us) must be our Communicants for want of Pastoral power. There is no Law or penalty that I ever knew of, to constrain any to come to us, receive us, hear us, or answer us, if we had never to much cause to question them of, or fortifie them against infidelity, heresie, ignorance, or wicked lives. And if any other accuse them to us (as few will) we must not judg them without trial.

It may be you will say. Would you have them constrained by force to speak with the Pastor, or give him any account of their faith, life, or knowledg, besides coming with others into the Church? I answer, No, we would have no force, as we have none. But then we would not be forced our selves by the Church-Lords and Monarchs to take our selves for the Pastors of such as refuse our Pastoral office, and to give the Sacrament, and all priviledges of Church-Communion, to every one in the Parish, who upon just suspicion of gross scandal, heresie, infidelity

lity or ignorance, obstinately refuseth to speak to us, and give us any account, or to be tried. I that have yearly tried my Parish by Personal Conference, know that thousands and thousands among us know not (and therefore believe not) whether Christ be God or man, or Angel, or what; nor who the Holy Ghost is, or why Christ died, rose; nor scarce any supernaturally revealed article of the Christian faith. And that many that understand them, believe them not. And I desire no Church-power, but not to take those, 1. For Christians; 2. And for my especial Christian flock, 1. Who are no Christians; 2. Who themselves refuse it. Without their consent the Minister is forced on them. They are forced by the sword to say that they are Christians, and to come to Church and Communicate. The old Christian Profession was, *I will be a Christian, and hold Communion with the Church, though I go to prison or death for it.* The Prelatical Christian Profession is, *I will rather be a Christian and Communicate, than I will lye in Gaol, and have all my Estate confiscate.* Seeing then that we have not the due power of a Pastor to deny our Office-administrations in Sacraments to those that refuse us in the other parts aforelaid, we are utterly disabled from so much as preparing men for the Bishops, or Chancellors Examination.

3. But if it were otherwise, that must not satisfy the Church-Monarch, who must judge himself, and therefore must hear by himself.

But you tell me, *It is plainly against experience in Ecclesiasticks.*

Ans. It's hard then to know any thing. For I dispute all this while, as if the question were, Whether men in *England* speak *English*. And if I herein err, I am incurable, and therefore I allow you to despair of me. You say, *The greatness of no City was thought sufficient to multiply Bishops.*

Ans. 1. Gods Institution was, that every Church have a Bishop, *Act. 14. 23, &c.*

2. A particular Church then was, *A Society of Neighbour-Christians, combined for Personal Communion in Gods Worship, and holy living, consisting of Pastor and flock.*

3. For 250 years I think, you cannot prove that any one Bishop in the world, save at *Alexandria* and *Rome*, had more such Congregations and Altars than one; nor these for a long time after the Apostles; nor in many Churches of one hundred years longer.

4. At

a bed of y^e h^e l^e m^e n^e o^e p^e r^e o^e t.

4. At *Antioch* (the third Patriarchate) *Ignatius* professeth that every Church had one *Altar*, and one *Bishop* with his *Presbyters* and *Deacons*, fellow-servants. And that in this one Church the *Bishop* must enquire of all by name, even *Servant-men* and *Maids*, and see that they absented not themselves from the Church. Why is not *Ignatius* confuted if he erred? Vid. *Mede* on the Point.

5. *Alexandria* and *Rome* by not multiplying *Bishops* as Churches or Converts needed it, began the grand sin and calamity which hath undone us, and therefore are not to be our Pattern. *Orbis major est urbe.*

6. Were *Bishops* necessarily to be distributed by *Cities*, the *Empires* that have few, or no *Cities*, must have few, or no *Bishops*; and an *Emperor* might, *aliud agendo*, depose all the *Bishops* by disfranchizing the *Cities*.

7. But every Corporation, *oppidum*, like our *Market-Towns*, was then truly *polis*: And if you will but procure every such *City* with us, to have a *Bishop*, and the Office of such *Bishops* to be to drive men from sin, and not to it, and to silence *Blasphemers*, and not faithful *Preachers* of the Gospel, all our controversies of *Prelacy* are then at an end.

8. And you must remember, that great *Cities* had long but few *Christians*, in comparison of the *Heathens* (till *Constantine's* time, and mostly long after). And when *Patrick* with his own hand Ordained Three Hundred and Fifty *Bishops* in your *Ireland*, they were but *Ecclesiarum fundatores*, and with them he founded but *septingentas Ecclesias*, and Ordained Five Thousand *Clerks*, if *Joceline* be true, *Vit. Patric. cap. 185.* and not rather the far more credible report of *Antonin. in Chron. tit. 11. cap. 18. § 2.* and *Vincent. specul. histor. lib. 20. cap. 23.* who say, that *Ecclesias fundavit 365. ordinavit Episcopos eodem numero 365. et eo amplius in quibus spiritus Dei erat. Presbyteros autem usq; ad 3000. ordinavit.* As *Usher* citeth them, *de primord. Eccl. Br. p. 957.* which is *Ninius* number there. So that here is no more Churches than *Bishops*, and about Nine *Presbyters* to a *Bishop*.

You tell me of above One thousand *Clergy-men* at *Rome*, in *Cornelius's* time.

Ans. 1. This was above Two hundred and Fifty years after *Christ's* Birth. 2. I never took all the impotent persons, poor,

poor, and Widows in the Church, to be Clergy-men, and Clergy-women. *Cornelius* his account is, *that there are Six and Forty Presbyters, Seven Deacons, Seven Sub-Deacons, Two and Forty Acolytes, Two and Fifty Exorcists, and Readers, with Porters, Widows, and impotent persons, above One thousand and Fifty souls,* considering, 1. How their Meetings were then obscure, and small, in Houses (as the tolerated Churches in *London*). And in so vast a City, in how many distant places. Besides the sub-urbicarian Assemblies. 4. And how many Presbyters used still to be with the Bishop in the same Assembly? 5. And that here are in all but Seven Deacons. 6. And that many then were Presbyters that used not to Preach, but for privater oversight, and as the Bishops Assessors. 7. And that the poorer sort most commonly received the Gospel. 8. And that none of these, but the Six and Forty Presbyters, had any power in the Discipline. 9. And that by all this reckoning, the whole Church maintained not, besides the Officers, near a thousand poor; we may probably conjecture, that the whole Church of that Bishop was not bigger than some one *London-Parish* (*Stepney, Giles, Cripplegate, Martins, &c.*) where are about Fifty thousand souls. 10. And, when none were Christians but persecuted Volunteers, they were the holiest, and best of men; and I have tried, that Six hundred such make less work for Discipline, than Ten of the Rabble that are driven into our Churches, and choose them rather than the Goal.

But when all's done, Two Cities under the power of great temptation, are not to be our Rule against Gods Word, and the state of all other Churches in the world, and undeniable experience.

It's true that you say, that to erect another Altar was counted Schism; that is, *Altare contra altare*; because when the Phrase came up, no Church had more than one Altar.

Your Instances intimated of *Antioch* and *Carthage*, I believe not; and can give you (had I liberty) a Volume of proof from Antiquity, that for Two hundred and Fifty years, if not much longer, *Ignatius's* Rule was true, that every Church had one Altar, and one Bishop, at least, except the two aforesaid.

Ulphilas was but an *Arrian* Bishop, of a few *Goths* newly turned *Arrians*, and the first that translated the Scriptures into
the

the *Gothick* Tongue; so that no Churches among them had the Scripture, till after his translating; and these few were presently persecuted to the death by *Athanasius* (*ut socrat. lib. 4. cap. 32.*) You may call these few, a Kingdom, if you please.

How few of the *Indians* were converted when *Fruementius* (not *Adeusius*, as you say) was made their Bishop, it's easie to gather by the History.

Scythia and *Persia* used to have each a Bishop, and he lived in the *Roman* Empire, as near them as he durst, as not being tolerated usually in their Land. And as few, it's like, *Moss* had among the *Arabians*; there being no mention in the History of any thing to persuade us, that he had many Churches under him, that I remember. And the work of these Bishops was to ordain Presbyters, who had the power of the Keys, & *excepta Ordinatione*, did all that Bishops did, as *Hierome* saith. So that then a Diocess had not one sole Church-Governour; and therefore where you gather that yet Discipline was not dissolved: I answer:

1. In all this you leave out a matter of chief consideration: *viz.* That all the Presbyters then were assistants in Discipline, and had a true Church-Government over the people, which now they have not.

2. It's strange that we that have eyes and ears must be sent to the *Indians* and ancient History, to know whether one Bishop can hear, and try, and admonish so many thousands at once, as we see by experience are those Objects of Discipline which the Scripture describeth, and when we see that it is not done.

And after all this, we have talk't but of a Phantasm; for it is not one Bishop, but one Lay man, a Chancellor, that useth this Decretory power of the Keys, over all these souls, so far as they are used, as to the ordinary Court-tryals and exercise; and the Bishop rarely medleth with it.

Again, Nonconformists doubt not to prove, that the Diocessan frame, which they dare not swear to, 1. Doth depose the *species* of Churches of Gods Institution. 2. And the Discipline it self almost totally. 3. And the *species* of Presbyters. 4. And the old *species* of Bishops. And instead of each of these, setteth up a new *species* of man's invention, wholly different, and inconsistent.

And

And that they are not willing to Swear, Subscribe, or deliberately and solemnly enter into a Church-Covenant, That in their Places and Callings they will never endeavour any alteration of this, no not by a request or word, you may less wonder than if some were then loath to Swear or Covenant never to endeavour to take down the Priests of *Dan* and *Bethel*, or reform the high places. It's dangerous making a solemn Ministerial Covenant, *Never to obey God in any one great matter, and never to repent of so doing.*

Again, our Reasons at the *Savoy* were, 1. About another matter: 2. Few of them received, or ever published to the world. And all that I have said to you is very little of our Cause; which I will not touch, unless I might prosecute it.

Your information about Bishop *Sanderson*, and the word, *Use of all things, &c.* is as the rest, to conquer our sense and experience. 1. The words in the *Act* are most plain, and Bishop *Sanderson de Jure*, concludeth, That Oaths (and Covenants) must be taken in the plain and proper sense. 2. It is notorious, that after the Lords in a *Proviso* of another *Act*, would have so expounded the *Act* of Uniformity, (that it is meant but of *consent to use, &c.*) and the Commons rejected it as intolerable, and upon a meeting of both Houses satisfied the Lords by their Reasons, who acquiesced in the rejection of that Exposition. And shall we still stretch our sense against the plain words, when the Parliament long after hath rejected such an Exposition?

Sir, it is much more (especially about Separation) which your lines invite me to say, and the cause requireth; but I fear I have wronged you by prolixity already; and much more by my freedom of speech, which is from my inclination to speak of things as they are, and is truly joined with a very great respect and honour of your self, commanded by your excellent Book, and judicious peaceable stile and temper. I rest,

Your unworthy Fellow-servant,

Jan. 5. 1672.

(worthy to be Silenced),

RI. BAXTER.

The short Answer to Mr. *Dodwell's* long Letter, fully answered in my Treatise of *Episcopacy*.

For the *Worthy and much Honoured* Mr. Henry Dodwell,
at Trinity Colledge near Dublin in Ireland.

Worthy Sir,

I Thankfully received yours of 28 Pages, from the hand of Mr. *Teate*. That I may not be again guilty of such hastiness in writing as you take notice of, I premise this to acquaint you, That your warning, with my backwardness to such work, and the multitude of Employments in which I am pre-engaged, shall keep me a while from that error, and you from the trouble. And if I take not your concluding counsel to avoid both timidity and partiality in this Cause, I shall notoriously contradict mine own interest. I have studied the point as diligently as I could, almost thirty years longer than you have lived in the world, (if the bearer of yours give me a true account of your age.) And yet I truly think it very possible that one of such admirable parts and diligence as your self, (evident in your great reading and accurate stile) may know much more in half that time. But if I can know my own thoughts, I have studied with a desire whatever it cost me, to know the truth. I dare not say, (*Impartially*) altogether. For I have flesh and blood, and who can choose but have a little *partiality* for that way which all his worldly interest pleadeth for? Could I have proved Conformity lawful (not to have contained a Covenant against the Church-form, Church-offices, and Church-discipline of Christs Institutions, and for upholding that Church Usurpation and Tyranny which began, and still continueth, the Divisions of the Christian World; nor the deliberate *Ministerial* owning of the Perjury of many thousands, &c.) I need not have undergone the common *scorn and hatred* that I have born, nor to have been deprived of all *Ministerial* maintenance, and silenced for eleven years of that part of my life, which should have been most serviceable (to add no more); my Reputation with those on the other extreme, I did

did voluntarily cast away, by opposing them (when I could as easily have kept it as most I know) lest it should be any snare or tempting interest to me. I assure you, That I have not wanted This was written long ago.
Prelatists, Presbyterians or Independents, &c. I confess I have read what the *Antiprelatists* say, such as *Beza, Gerson, Bucer, Didocla. Parker, Bains, Jacob. Blondel, Salmasius, &c.* But I have more diligently studied, since I was twenty years of age, the chiefest on the other side, *Saravia, Bilson, Downham, Hooker, Burges, Covell, Bridg, Bancroft, Whitgift, Spalatensis*, and since *Petavius, Hammond*, and multitudes more. And I have now, as you desired, read over *all yours*, that I might see the end, before I past my judgment on the beginning. But our apprehensions are various, as our preconceptions are; I find that we are all forestalled, and readiest to learn of our selves, who are not always the happiest Teachers of our selves. What we have first laid in, is usually made the standard of all that followeth; and all must be reduced into a due Conformity and subserviency to our former sentiments. You have shewed great learning, ingenuity and piety, and in a very fluent stile expressed what was in your mind; and made me remember what one answereth him that said, *Hooker* was yet unanswered, *viz.* Reduce what you would have answered, to Argument, and it will soon be done. I find, that it had been much better to have said nothing, than to have begun in such a manner of dispute, in which the further we go, the less we understand one another, and make each other molestation, instead of edification: For plainly I find, that (though much may be learned out of so rare a discourse as you have vouchsafed me, yet) it doth very little at all to any dispatch of our present controversie, but might easily deceive me by avocation, if I would forget what it is that I dispute about: For I perceive, 1. That we agree not in our sense of the *terms* which we make use of: And from thence you infer some great and dangerous errors in my judgment. 2. We agree least of all in common and obvious matters of *fact*, which are before our eyes, and the things of which I have had almost an Ages experience. 3. I find, that a very great part, if not the far greatest of all your discourse, is written upon a mis-understanding of my *Words* and *judgment*. And if one were to publish such kind of Writings, how tiresome would it be to the Reader, should I set down

a particular account of all your passages that are besides the question, and all that proceed from such misunderstanding ? I speak not by way of blaming you ; for we are not competent Judges of other mens actions, till we know the Reasons of them : that may be laudable, which crosseth our desires. Perhaps you had Reasons to pass by the chief part of my explications of my sense, and of the matter of fact, and say nothing to them : And perhaps you had Reasons when I had told you our Country-distribution of Acts of Government, into Legislative, and Judicial, and Executive, to make use still of the Equivocal word *Decretory*, and to understand by it (as you saw cause) only the Legislative power, and to leave out the *Judicial*, which was all that I controverted : It may be you had Reason, when I talk of a single, or Parochial Church, to say, I supposed in it but a single Pastor : You are not accountable to me for such errors, be they never so causeless in my opinion. It may be you had Reason to write against the old Nonconformists that are in another world ; and to think, that for the Names sake it concerned us : and to plead, that Conformity to all the present Covenants, and Oaths, and Subscriptions, is necessary, because you could wish the Discipline more Regular, as if we were to Subscribe to what is in your wishes. It may be you had Reason to suppose the Parish-Priests to have the *Government of the People*, even the power of the *Church-Keys* (and yet sometimes to unsay it again), without answering my Proof to the contrary, when I take it for the chief supposition that causeth my Nonconformity : And to prove copiously, that a Bishop may govern a Diocese, when he hath a Governor under him in every Parish, without answering my Proofs, that he hath no such under him, but hath, *quantum in se*, half degraded the Presbyters. And when I said, that Discipline is not possible under such Diocesans as are with us, you might have Reason that I know not of, to leave out, *as are with us*, and to prove it possible with other Diocesans that have governing Presbyters under them. Perhaps you had Reason to confound the *Convincing, Persuasive, Declarative Power of a Judge*, with that of a private man, and thence to raise the supposition which you raise. Perhaps you know some *Medium* between corporal force, and Mulcts, proper to the Magistrate, and Authoritative perswasion, and prevailing on the Conscience by the Reverence of Gods Laws, though I know none : And you were not bound

bound to teach me what you know. Perhaps you had Reason to think that I may Subscribe, That no man in Three Kingdoms that hath Vowed it, is bound to endeavour to alter our Church-Government by Lay-Chancellors, because you defend it not, but wish it altered: And it may be you have Reasons unknown to me, that none but Irregular endeavours are there disclaimed; and that our Lawgivers spake universally, and would be interpreted particularly, with many such like. But *abscondita & quæ supra nos, nihil ad nos*——What I may not pretend to understand, I will not presume to censure, but only say, That I am incapable of being informed by them. This I am satisfied of, that my Schismatical Principles take into Church-Communion such as you, and those that are in knowledg below, not only you, but me, even the weakest true Christians. But upon your Catholick terms, no man of my *measure* of knowledg must be tolerated to be a Preacher, or a Christian in Church-Communion, nor live at least out of Goal, or some such penalty. And if one at *Muscovy* can get a Courtier to make him a Bishop, he and such other are the Church (which why you still put it in the feminine Gender when it consisteth of Masculine Court-Bishops, I know not.) And if he command us to do that which we account the most inhumane perjury, if he think it to be but the renunciation of an unlawful Oath, as I understand you, we are Schismaticks if we obey him not. Whether in cases of commanded blasphemy, and all other crimes, we must accordingly renounce our understandings, I know not. Though there be somewhat of Irony in all this, there is nothing but what is consistent with the high estimation of your extraordinary worth. And I must say, that our different Educations, I doubt not, is a great cause of our different sentiments. Had I never been a Pastor, nor lived out of a Colledge, (and had met with such a taking Orator) I might have thought as you do. And had you conversed with as many Country-people as I have done, and such, I think you would have thought as I do. My great deceiver is Sense and Experience. I am inclined to look near me, in judging of present matters of fact: As if our Controversie were, Whether one Schoolmaster can govern a thousand Schools without any but Monitors under him, and Teachers that have no Government. And your way is from old Histories, to prove that some body did so 1400 years ago, or a thousand, in some places of the world, if stories deceive us

not;

not; and therefore it may be so now. Though none of those excellent men do it, who are put into the places of the silenced Schismatical Ministers, nor none of the excellent Bishops that are over us, who are so good that one of them no doubt would do it, were it possible. But seriously I take it for a great mercy of God, that honest Christians of little learning have that *experience* in the *Practicals* of Religion, which the *studied* accurate plausible Orations of contradictors cannot overcome, though they are not so well skill'd at the same weapons as to answer them. Sir, pardon and accept this short and thankful acknowledgment, that I have received your Learned Tractate, till I take the leisure (if I so long live) to return you an answer suitable to your discourse and expectations. I rest,

Ang. 5. 1673.

Your Servant,

RICH. BAXTER.

Mr. Dodwell desiring me not to make haste in answering him, I sent him only this; intending more; but want of time, and the quality of the task, (being put but to answer a multitude of words) delayed it till he came to *London*, and then I thought we might talk it out, which we oft tried to little purpose. His great proof of large Churches, of many Altars, from the only two that swelled first, *Rome* and *Alexandria*, are so fully answered in this annexed Letter which worthy Mr. Clerkson wrote to me, that I think he needs no other answer; since published by me: As is a full discourse on the Subject, by Mr. Clerkson himself, against Dr. Stillingfleet.

A Copy of the Letter to Mr. Dodwell, March 12. 1681.

S I R,

Since your Speech with me, I have thought again of what you insisted on, and find it consist of these four Points: 1. Whether I charge you with Popery, or at least, do not vindicate you when so accused. 2. Your reasons against answering *Koetius* and me. 3. Your desire to know my terms of concord. 4. Your perswading me to give over Preaching. Left words

be

be mis-understood, or forgotten, I send you my Answer to each of these.

I. I take it to be none of my business, to tell what Religion other men are of, till I am called to it: And then I take my self bound to judg every man what he professeth to be, till I can disprove it. 2. I distinguish the Name (*e. g.* of Protestant, or Papist) from the Thing. Accordingly, 1. I am sure you deny your self to be a Papist, and I believe you. 2. What you mean by the word, I refer all men that talk of it to your Books, which are fitter to tell your mind than I am, that know no mans heart: *Grotius* took a Papist to be one that flattered Popes, taking all to be just which they said and did, and not one that consented to all the General Councils. 3. You shall chuse what Name I shall call you by: If it be *Protestant*, far be it from me to deny it you; But as your Book publisheth your judgment to the world, you will give me leave to tell men what is in it: And to profess my self, that I am no *such Protestant*, as takes the Church of *Rome* to be a true Church of uninterrupted succession, which gave our Bishops their Office and Power; and that all the Reformed that have not Diocesan Bishops, are no Churches, no Ministers, have no Sacraments, no pardon of sin, or hope of salvation, by promise, and known ordinary grounds, which the *Roman* Church hath. Yea, that they sin against the Holy Ghost: Yea, and that this is the case of the Episcopal Protestants, that have not had an uninterrupted succession of Episcopal Ordination; and that the *French* Protestants were better turn Papists, than to continue such Protestants as they are. I take all this for your judgment: But I vindicate you so far as to say, that you oft contradict your self, and so possibly may yet come off. If you should say, that neither such Protestants, nor Papists, have Sacraments, and part in the Covenant of grace, pardon, and salvation, you would leave so few for Heaven, and so many for Hell, as I will not imagine you to be guilty of.

II. As to the Second, I must tell all, that I take it but for trifling, to call us to answer the same things again, which are answered so long ago, and have no reply from Papists, or any other. And I doubt not, but you know that it is the main charge which the Papists assault the Reformed Churches with, and put their chief trust in, which you also bring against them: And

we still believe, that *Jansenius* did it much stronger than you; and much more than yours, is by *Voetius* against him fully answered; and your denial moveth us not.

III. To satisfy your Third demand, I remember a small Script, which I published 1659, or 1660, and therewith send it you; by which (with what I read to you) you may conjecture at my terms, specially if you joyn my *Preface to Cathol. Theologie*, I take it for granted, that it will not satisfy you. But pardon my freedom for saying that, while I perceive your Confidence ordinarily to go quite beyond your Proofs; and while my Principles call me to love more as brethren, than yours do, and engage me not to justify persecution of men better than my self, I shall think never the worse of them for that.

IV. As to your judgment for my ceasing to Preach, I dare not obey it: I think if I say, these men forbid me, God will not take it for an excuse, after such charges as Scripture layeth down, and such promises as in Ordination I made, and such necessity of souls as I am sure of, and such encouragements as God hath given me. I fear hearing, *Thou slothful servant, &c.* as much as the guilt of other heinous sins: I have not lived idly; and if I silence my self, I invite God by death to silence me, and judg me, as obeying man against him. I am past doubt, that Satan and my flesh give me the same counsel as you do. I have abundant arguments for my Preaching, which I never heard a rational answer of, and which such a poor Objection as, *Then there will be no Order*, will not confute, especially when *all the Ministers of England are bound to be Nonconformists, and consequently to cease Preaching, if I am so bound.* And why not next, *all Christians to cease hearing, and praying, if so forbidden?* If it be only Christs Gospel that I Preach, I cannot but suspect the voice that saith, Give over Preaching. Accept this account of the sense of

Your Friend,

Rich. Baxter.

To Mr. Dodwell, Nov. 15th 1680.

S I R,

Yours of Oct. 16th I received, Nov. 11th, which intimateth the Second Edition of your Letters, which I hear not of; your last Letter to me, signifying your purpose to publish your long Letter from *Ireland* to me, caused me to Print an old Treatise of Episcopacy, which I had cast by, and now send you as an answer to that Letter. I thank you for your admonition, and desire of my repentance: It shall make me, if I can, search yet more diligently; but I find no probability of being able; the like lamentations of my sin, and wrong to the Church, I have long had from *Papists*, *Antinomians*, *Anabaptists*, and *Separatists*, and some *Quakers*, and *Seekers*; and I despair of satisfying them; nor can I be of all their minds: and I find here but one Argument to draw me to yours, (*viz.*) my taking the Oath of Canonical obedience. And 1. You know not that I took it: Many Ordained men did not. To tell you the truth, I entered so rawly, that though I well remember my Subscription, I remember not that I took that Oath: I remember I took it not for my Ordination, but at the same time taking a License for a School, some Oath the Register suddenly thrust on me, and I remember not what it was (which was, and is my sin). 2. If I took it, surely I never intended to bind my self to any but my true Ordinary. And when he is dead, and the very Order for near Twenty years publicly (though culpably) put down, and none existent where I lived, I never saw it proved, that I am sworn to all that after are set up over others, by the King, without the Clergies, or Peoples choice, or consent, contrary to the Judgment of the Church for One thousand years, and that without, and against my own consent: And that he that sweareth obedience to his present Ordinary, is thereby sworn, though he never dream't of it to all that ever shall succeed him, what changes soever be made, and though judging them Usurpers, I renounce them. If it be said, that I virtually consent by the Convocation; I deny it, nor did the City of *London* consent;
O for

for they had not one chosen Clerk there. They chose Mr. *Calamy* and me, and we were both refused by the Bishop, and only the Dignitaries of the City admitted. What if I had sworn obedience in 1639. to the Presbytery in *Scotland*, or 1649. in *England*; and after they are put down, and I find them to be an unlawful power, and they are restored again, doth my first Oath bind me to the latter stock against my consent? 3. The *English Ecclesiastical Law-Books*, which I have read, do tell me, that the Chancellor, Official, Commissary, Archdeacons, and every *Judex Ordinarius* is my Ordinary (whatever you say against it): And some Bishops themselves have judged the Lay-Chancellors Judgment, by the use of the Keys, to be a great sin. *Quest.* Whether then an ignorant Oath to obey such Usurpers, repented of, do bind to obey them still? What if in *France* I had sworn obedience to their Bishops, and after see that it was an unlawful Oath, *quod materiam*, am I bound by it till death? 4. I swore to obey them but in *licitis & honestis*. And I do not know that ever I therein disobeyed those that I swore to; no, nor the latter reduced stock: Either I have proved the degenerate sort, described in this Treatise, to be a heinously sinful depravation of the Church, and its Government, and an injury against Christ, by deposing his Church-Form, Discipline, and Officers, or not: if not, evince it, and I will thank you; if yea, to comply with such sin, or in any calling to forbear detecting it by writing, is an Omission which is not *licitum vel honestum*. An unlawful Oath against a thing indifferent, will not bind me, if the King do but command that indifferent thing; much less will an ignorant Oath to obey Church-Usurpers, and corrupters, oblige me against Christs commands. Nor do I think it *licitum vel honestum*, to renounce my Ministry, sacrilegiously, and perfidiously break my Ordination-Vow to God, and forbear Preaching Christs Gospel to needy souls, because they forbid me.

In a word, Sir; I unfeignedly thank you for your desire to save me from dying in sin. I have great reason to make it my greatest care. Constant pain and languor, call to me, neither to dissemble, nor delay: When I cannot know my own heart so well as you do, I may come to believe you, that it is unruly Pride. Till then I am past doubt, that could any abasement, any labour, any cost, help me to know that you are in the right,

right, and I in the wrong, I would most joyfully undertake it. But such warnings as your's awaken my Conscience, so that I dare not die in the guilt of active, or omisive compliance with those men, 1. Whole degenerate state I confidently judg to be the dangerous Malady of the Church, and destructive to a right Church-state, Church-Officers and Government. 2. Whole Canons of Government are such as they are. 3. Who have since I had any understanding, done that against serious godliness in *England* which they did, and these (near) Twenty years, done what they have done, procuring the silencing, and outward ruin of about Two thousand such Ministers of Christ, as I know to have been the most pious, faithful, and successful in true Ministerial work, of any that ever I could know; and such as I am fully perswaded no Nation under Heaven have Two thousand better. And yours, or other mens accusations, or contrary judgment, cannot make me ignorant of this, which experience, and great acquaintance have told me. 4. And Church-History, which tells me what such have done in former Ages, increase my fear of dying in the guilt of participating of their sin. I know of no other Motives that I have. The sum of my request to you is, That instead of telling me what the Pope, or any Usurper may say, that I should *be humble and obedient*, you will but tell me what means I should use, which I have omitted, to get my judgment informed, if I err, and to become of your mind, and as wise as you. I again intreat you to tell me the way, and I shall give you most hearty thanks. Did I not know your judgment and mine to be so distant, as puts me out of hope of attaining my end, I would have sent you Nine or Ten Proposals, for the meer reducing of the Parish Churches to their necessary state, without altering any thing of the Diocesans power or grandure, save only their power of the Sword, which yet as they are Magistrates we submit to. That your former Letters brought me not to your judgment, you may see, by the book which I send you, cometh not to pass by hasty judging, nor without that which seemeth Reason to me after my long and best consideration. I am fully assured, not byassed hereto by worldly interest, which hath long lain on the other side. Accept this Account from

Nov. 15. 1680.

Your unfeigned, though dissenting Friend,

Ri. Baxter.

For

received by the
 church of England
 1680

July 9. 1677.

For my much honoured Friend Mr. Henry Dodwell.

SIR,

SINCE the writing of my last to you, your own words have acquainted me, 1. That you take my Principles to have some inconstitence or contradiction. 2. That you think I have not yet told you what Church-Government it is that I would have, or how it can attain its end. 3. That you suppose that *denying men the Sacrament of the Lords Supper* is a coercive power sufficient to force unwilling men to obey Church-Governours. 4. That you hold that all Religious Assemblies not allowed by the Bishops, are unlawful, and therefore that we must rather use none than such.

I. As to the first, no reason obligeth me to believe you till you prove it; which must be by citing the inconsistent words. How easie is it to tell you or any man, that you speak contradictions? Is accusing, proving? And you have told me by experience that mistaking Hearers and Readers understand not mens words so well as the Speakers or Writers do. When you so widely mistook a speech of mine, when I had told you that as far as I could learn by my own acquaintance, and the report of the Members themselves, there was but one known *Presbyterian* in the House of Commons when the Wars began, (I named you a credible witness yet living), and you report that I said, there was but one *Presbyterian* in the Assembly of Divines? May not my writing be as much mistaken by you? Prove your Charge, and I will confess my contradictions, and give you thanks.

II. As to the second I was afraid I had used more words than needs; if all that I have said tell you not what I mean, you may excuse me from adding more, which are like to be no more significant; you must name me the particulars that you are unsatisfied in, before I can know what is needful to be added.

ed: One particular you did name, *viz.* whether I hold a power in the Church to deny men the Sacrament that would have it? I left you no reason to make a doubt of it. If this be it, pardon the repetitions which you make me guilty of, and I shall renew my account.

1. I believe that Christ hath instituted the office of the Sacred Ministry (which the Ancients called *Sacerdotium*), as subordinate to his *Teaching, Ruling, and Sacerdotal* office; and that being obliged to Disciple and baptize the Nations, and to teach them Christs commands, and to guide them in holy Doctrine, Worship and Discipline, they are *authorized* to all that they are *obliged to*; and that it is their office-work to administer Baptism and the Lords Supper, and that they have the Church-Keys to judg whom to take in by Baptism, what food to feed the children of the Church with, and whom to cast out of its Communion.

2. I believe that this power is limited and regulated by Christs own universal Laws, and that they are not lawless or arbitrary; but he hath bound them by a just description, whom to *take in*, *what food* to give them, and whom to *cast out*. And that he hath given them no power to cross or violate these his Laws. And if they do it notoriously, it is null and worse, and no act of authority but of sin. *e. g.* If Bishops baptize unconverted Infidels, or give the other Sacrament to such, or to notorious wicked impenitent persons.

3. I believe that if one or many Bishops or Priests do disobey these Laws of Christ, their sin doth not oblige all other persons to rebel or sin with them, or disoblige them from their duty. *e.g.* If some Bishops should refuse to receive penitent believers and their seed into the Church by Baptism, others are nevertheless bound to receive them, and not all the Bishops in the world to keep them out because some do it sinfully? so if some Bishops would feed them with unsound Doctrine, or corrupt Gods Worship, (*e.g.* with Image-worship, or language unintelligible, &c.) others must not follow them, but do better. If some Bishops turn Christs sheep out of his fold and pasture unjustly, denying them Communion, others must not do wickedly with them, but must receive such; else one tyrant might oblige all the Churches to tyranny.

4. But

4. But while the power of the Keys is lawfully used, he that is justly cast out of the Communion of one Church, should not be received to Communion with any other that hath just notice of his Exclusion, till the cause be removed.

5. But the notice of it concerneth not those that living out of reach, are incapable of Communion with that person. If a woman in this Parish be Excommunicated as a Scold, or a man as a Drunkard, &c. the Bishop is not bound to send notice of their names and case to *Ethiopia* or *Armenia*, nor to all the Christian World; no nor to all *England*. Nor do they use to do it to all the Parishes in the Diocese, but only to that one where the person liveth. But I doubt not but all *that Church should know of it*, of which he was a Communicating member, (by the way, why is not all the Diocese told of it, but that men are conscious that he hath not Personal communion with them; and therefore need not be so Excommunicated?)

6. Therefore mens limited capacity allowing them *Personal Communion* but in a narrow compass, there needs no Confederacy of all the Christian World for the rejecting of those that one of them hath first rejected.

7. But in well-ordered agreeing Churches none should be received presently into the Communion of another Church, without due notice of his aptitude or capacity; which regularly should be by the Certificates of the Church whence he came, called *Communicatory Letters*; or if he was never before admitted to the Sacrament because not at age, his own Personal profession giveth him right; and so it doth in the Countries where through neglect such Certificates or Testimonies are not in use, sobeit there come in no proof against him, that he stands Excommunicate, or deserveth it. A professing Christian hath right to Communion if he travel through all the Churches in the World, till his profession be disproved, or his claim disabled by just testimony. If a man be Excommunicate in, *e. g.* *Lincoln-Diocese* in one Parish-Church, above a thousand Parishes more of the same Church-Diocesan, may receive him for want of notice, unless they are bound to receive no stranger of another Parish; and that is a kind of Excommunicating of all Christians from the Communion of all the Christian World, except one Parish.

8. The Legal Excommunication, which is only a general pronouncement that such or such sinners *in specie* shall be *actually* excommunicate, is done already by God himself in his Universal Laws. And no man ought to make Laws to Excommunicate any that Gods Laws do not decree to be Excommunicate, save that when there is a difficulty in discerning whether this or that *Doctrine* or *practice* be indeed the sin so condemned in Gods Laws, mens Laws may expound it, to remove that difficulty. If all were excommunicate that Gods own Laws do require to be excommunicate, alas ! how great would the number be ? So little need is there, that Voluminous Councils should excommunicate many more ; and that Councils should be added to Councils to the end of the world, to make new Laws for excommunicating men.

9. Where God hath commanded all Christians in his Laws, to avoid any sort of wicked men, and with such not to eat, the fact being once notorious, the person is so far, *ipso jure*, excommunicate, as that all are bound to avoid familiarity with that person, though no Bishop sentence him : But the Pastors having the Church Keys, we must not go out of the Church, because such a man is there ; for who shall be in the Church, is at his Judgment ; but who shall be at my Table, is at mine.

10. But if the Church it self be *essentiated* of such as God thus commandeth all to avoid, and this be *notorious*, every Christian must avoid that Church. The Essentials of a Church are the *pars regens* & *pars subdita*, the Pastors, and the Body of the flock. If either be so far corrupt, the Church is corrupt : When *any one essential* part is *wanting*, or *depraved*, then the *Essence* is wanting, or depraved : Therefore where many Pastors make up the *pars regens* of a particular Church, it is not the heresie, or wickedness of some one only that will warrant a separation ; because *one* is but an *integral*, and not an essential part : But where *one Bishop only* is the *essential regent constitutive* part, there that *one mans heresie*, or notorious wickedness (such as we are commanded to have no Communion with) will allow us to avoid that Church, as a Church, though not each Member of it, who are parts still of the Universal Church.

If I knew what further explication of my thoughts it is that you desire, I should be ready to give it you.

III. As to the *coercive power* which you talk of, it is strange if we can differ about the nature of it ; but we greatly differ, I suppose, about the extent of it. Pardon me, if to avoid confusion, I first speak of the *Name*, and then of the *Thing*. 1. Though our ordinary use of the words, *coactive* and *coercive*, be to signify that which worketh either on the *Body*, and its provision only, or on the *Mind* by force upon the *Body*, or *Estate* ; yet if you will but tell me what you mean by it, so distinctly that we may not be entangled with Logomachy, take it in what sense you will. The words which you use are the signification of your mind : I desire but to understand, and to be understood : I follow Bishop *Bilson* (of *Christ. Obed.*), and others commonly, that distinguish the power of *Magistrates* and *Pastors*, by the Names of the power of the *Sword*, and of the *Word*. By the first, they mean all power of corporal mulcts and penalties, directly such (for he that grieveth the mind, consequently troubleth the body). By the latter, they mean all that Official power of *Gods Word* and *Sacraments* which worketh by the senses of hearing, seeing and tasting, upon the *Conscience*, that is, on the Understanding and Will, and by these reformeth practice. The word is thus delivered, either *Generally*, by *common Doctrine*, which is historical, assertive, precepts, prohibitions, promises or threatnings, or by personal application of these.

1. By meer words, as in personal instruction, precept, threatening, &c. and by declaration, that *this person proved and judged guilty of impenitency, in such and such sin, is incapable of Church-communion, therefore by authority from Christ I command him to forbear, and you to avoid him. And such a one being proved innocent or penitent, hath by Gods Law right to Communion with his Church, therefore I absolve him, invite him, receive him, and command you in Christs name to hold loving Communion with him.*

2. On it is the application of words and *Sacramental signs* together, by solemn tradition and investiture ; or the denying of such Sacraments. Briefly, *Magistrates* by mulcts, prisons, exile, stripes, &c. work on the body ; *Pastors* have no such power, but by *General Doctrine* and personal application by words and *Sacraments* (given or denied) work on the mind or conscience ; all which some call a *Perswasive power* ; distinguishing (as *Camero* clearly) between private *persuasion* of an equal, &c. and *Doctoral, Pastoral,*

Pastoral, Official, Persuasion, whose force is by the *Divine authority of the persuader*, used in *Teaching, Disciplinary judging, and Sacraments*. If you will call this last *coercive*, or by any other name, you have your liberty. I will do my part that you may understand me, if I may not understand you.

2. Now *ad rem*; can we *disagree how far this constraineth the unwilling*? Not without some great neglect or culpable defect. I may suppose then that we are agreed of all these particulars:

1. That Gods Laws have told us who must or must not have Sacramental Communion, which we must obey, whatever be the effects.

2. That Excommunication is not *only*, nor *always chiefly*, to bring the person Excommunicated to obedience (no more than hanging) but to keep the purity and reputation of the Church, and the safety of the members, and to warn others.

3. That the way by which it is to affect the offender, is,
1. By *shaming him*; 2. By striking his Conscience with the sense of Gods displeasure declared thus by his Ministers.

4. So far as the Sacrament is a means of *conveying grace*, to deny it, is not to reform but to destroy. But when the person hath made himself *incapable* of the *benefit* of the Sacrament, and apt to receive it abusively to his hurt, then it may possibly humble him to be denied it.

5. If the denial of the Sacrament work not on a mans Conscience morally (as threatnings do) it no way compelleth him to his duty, nor saveth him from sin.

6. *De facto* many hundred thousands of ignorant wicked members of Episcopal Churches are so far from being constrained to goodness by being without the Sacrament, that they are content to be without it, and loth to be forced to it.

7. The more sin and wickedness any man hath, the less true conscience; and the less conscience, the less doth he regard a due Excommunication.

8. The Bishops themselves are conscious of the insufficiency of their Excommunications alone to compel any to obedience, while they confess that without the Secular power of the sword to back it, they would be but laught at, and despised by the most. Nor durst they ever try to govern by their Church Keys alone among us without the enforcement of the sword. And at the same time while they Excommunicate them from the Sacra-

ment, they have a Law to lay them in Gaol, and utterly ruin them if they will not receive it. How loth are the Bishops to lose this compelling Law.

9. I think few of my acquaintance in *England* do believe that any great number are brought to holy reformation, no nor to Episcopal obedience, by the fear of being kept from the Sacrament, but that which they fear is the Corporal penalty that followeth; lay by that, and you may try.

10. If you will trust to that spiritual power alone, & *valent quantum valere potest*, without corporal force, few that I know of will resist you, (but many thousands will despise you, as the Bishops well foresee) bring as many to obedience by it as you can. But if you mean that you must needs have the Magistrate to second you, as your Licitor or Executioner, and to imprison, fine, banish, burn, &c. it would be too gross hypocrisy to call the effects of this coercive power, the effects of Excommunication, and to call it *coercive* power to deny a man the Sacrament, because he seareth the sword.

11. *De facto*, there are supposed to be in the Parish that you dwell in, above 60000 souls, suppose 10000 of these yearly receive the Sacrament (though some say it is not 5000.) Are the other 40000 compelled to obedience by not communicating.

12. All those forbear your Sacrament without any sense of coercion or loss, 1. Who believe (as you do) that Sacramental Communion is a sin, where it cannot lawfully be had (that is, say you, where the Bishops forbid it; say they, where Gods Laws forbid it, by reason of adherent sin. 2. And that, take the Bishops who forbid it them to be Usurpers, that have no true calling (as all the *Papists* do of our Bishops, and many others.) 3. Who take it to be more eligible, yea a necessary duty to hold Communion with purer societies. 4. Besides all those Sectaries that make light of Sacraments in general. What *Papists*, *Quakers*, *Anabaptists*, Separatists, &c. are compelled to any good by the Bishops denying them the Sacrament?

13. Nothing but *Ignorance* or *Impudence* can deny that the difficulty of knowing whose Excommunication it is that is to be dreaded as owned by God, hath encouraged professed Christians so confusedly to Excommunicate one another, as that this Excommunication hath been so far from constraining most to repentance, that it hath made Christianity a horrid scandal to Infidels and Heathens,

by

by setting the Christian World in the odious confusion of Excommunicating one another. To give some instances how far Excommunication is not coercive.

1. Who but the Devil was the gainer of Pope *Victor's* Excommunicating the *Asians* about *Easter-day*? Did it compel them to obedience?

2. When the Orthodox Excommunicated the *Arrians*, did it force them to obey? When they got almost all the Bishops for them, and Excommunicated and destroyed their Excommunicators?

3. When the *Cecilians* (or Orthodox) and the *Donatists* for so many ages Excommunicated one another, meerly upon the difference which party had the true Ordained Bishops, did Excommunications force them to obedience?

4. (To pass forty other Sects) when *Rome* Excommunicated, yea and prosecuted the *Novatians*, did it compel them to obey? And did not *Atticus*, *Sisinnius* and *Proclus* win more by allowing them their own Communion, and living with them in love and peace? *Chrysostome* since threatned the *Novatian* Bishop that he would silence him; but he quickly recalled his word before they parted, and durst not do it.

5. Did *Cyril's* Counsel against the *Joannites* win them, or harden them? Was it not *Atticus* and *Proclus* love and lenity that ended that division?

6. Did the Excommunicating of the *Nestorians* by *Cyril*, compel them to obedience, when so much of the East are *Nestorians* to this day, and requite the Orthodox with their Excommunications?

7. Did the Excommunicating of those that rejected the Council of *Calcedon*, (the *Eutychians*, and *Acephali*) compel them to obedience, when many Emperours took their part, and the greater number of Bishops joined with them, and they equally damned those that received the Council for many Princes reigns. And when so great a part of Christians as are the *Jacobites*, *Abassines*, &c. own *Dioscorus*, and condemn that Council to this day?

8. Did the Excommunicating of the old Hereticks, *Gnosticks*, *Basilidians*, *Valentinians*, *Paulinists*, *Apollinarians*, *Eumonians*, *Ætians*, *Photinians*, *Macedonians*, *Priscillians*, &c. compel them to obedience at all? or did they regard it?

9. Did the Excommunicating of the parties that were for silence

lence (the *Acacians*, as to the *Monothelites*, and those that were for *Zeno's Henoticon*), compel them to obedience?

10. Did the mutual damnations of the *Phantasticks*, *Justinian's* and *Gamas* party, and the *Corrupticola*, force either to obedience?

11. Did the Excommunications of the *Monothelites* compel them to obedience? when in the days of *Philippicus* they had a Council, saith *Binnius*, of *Innumerable Bishops*? And he saith, that the General Council at *Trul.* called *Quinisextum* was of the same men that were in the approved sixth General Council, and that they were *Monothelites*.

12. Did the several Excommunications of the *Constantinopolitan Bishops* by the *Roman*, and of the *Roman* again by them, and the *Alexandrian*, &c. compel either party to obedience?

13. Had the Pope Excommunicated the *Africans* in the long fraction in the days of *Aurelius* and *Austin*, would it have compelled them to obedience?

14. When the Pope (at last) joined with *Justinian's* General Council against the *Tris Capitulo*, and condemned the refusers of it, did it compel his own neighbour-Bishops to obedience, when they so generally forsook him, that there were not three Bishops to Consecrate the Pope, but he was fain to use a Presbyter, and when they set up a Patriarch at *Aquileia* as their chief, and condemned or forsook the Pope for near an hundred years?

15. Did the Popes Excommunicating of the *Goths* in *Spain* and other parts, compel them to obey him?

16. Did *Augustinus* rejection of the *Britains*, and the *Britains* and *Scots* long refusing Communion with the *Romanists*, compel either party to obey?

17. Did the Excommunicating of *Leo Isaurus*, *Constantine*, and the rest of the *Iconoclasts*, compel them to obey?

18. Did the Excommunicating of the *Albigenses* and *Waldenses*, bring them to obedience? Or was it not (say some Historians) the murder of about two Millions, that *solitudinem fecit, quam vocant pacem*?

19. Did the Excommunications of the Emperours, *Frederick*, *Henry*, &c. and their adherents, as the *Venetian Interdict*, compel them to obedience?

20. Did the Excommunicating of the *German Protestants*, and Queen *Elizabeth*, and the *English Protestants*, bring them to obedience? How many such instances may I give you?

If

If you say, To what purpose is all this? I shall say, No doubt for knowing a man can tell. It is to tell you why I expect no more *ecclesiastical* power from meer Excommunication than experience and reason will allow me to expect. And no such perfect obedience and universal concord by it, as your words import.

And some questions I here crave your Answer of.

Qu. 1. The same that you so much urge on me: Seeing this matter of fact is undeniable, and Excommunication hath done no more than it hath done, Is all Church-Government therefore vain? Or what is your own way of remedy?

Qu. 2. Seeing it is Bishops themselves, that for so many hundred years excommunicated one another as Hereticks and Schismatics, how shall they, or their flocks be certain which Bishops they be, whose excommunications they must take, as Gods act, and which not? I pray answer it plainly. 1. If any say, *it must be the Majority, or greater number*, then so were the *Arians* too long, so were the *Eutychians*, so were the *Monothelites*, so were the *Iconoclasts*; so the *Papists* say they are now. If you say, *The Bishops in a General Council*, that's almost all one. What Wars were there between many General Councils; and how long was it the Religion of one side, to be for one, and curse the other; and of the other side, to curse all that did not receive that? How shall we know which Council to obey? If you say as *Binnius*, that all Councils have just so much power as the Pope giveth them, how shall we know that this is true? But I suppose that will not be your answer. If you say, *we must obey that which is Orthodox*, who is the Judge? If every man; then they that judg the excommunicating Bishops, or Councils, not Orthodox, will not obey them. Truly I know not what answer to expect from you.

Qu. 3. Can that man expect, that excommunicating should set all right, and bring men to obedience now in the end of the world, who is constrained (against his will) to be certain, that abused excommunications have been the great means of setting the Christian world into pernicious Schisms and Confusions?

Qu. 4. At this day, when the Papal Church unchurches all the Christian Churches that are not Subjects to the Pope; and when the Greek Church excommunicateth the Papal, and most continue damning one another, can you think, that even excommunicating is the remedy to cure these Schisms, and set all right?

Qu. 5. If denying men the Sacrament, will constrain men to obedience, why do not the Episcopal Churches through the world, cure the Peoples sins by keeping them from the Sacrament, when so great numbers are prophane, and sensual, and worldlings, and wicked, how easie a means of Conversion were it to forbid them all the Sacrament?

Qu. 6. Is it no contradiction to say, that the Sacrament is Gods means of giving Sanctification? and yet that keeping men from it is the means?

Qu. 7. But if you mean not *constraining* to obey God, but only to obey the Bishop, and not God, what good will such obedience do the mans soul, that will not save him? I confess the Magistrate that hath the Sword, may compel men to the use of the *necessary suitable means* of Conversion and Grace; and those means may further Sanctification.

IV. As to the Fourth Point, I have said enough of it to you heretofore.

1. If no Religious Assemblies for Preaching, Praying, and Sacraments, be lawful, but what the Bishops allow, then God hath put it into the Bishops power, whether he shall have any such publick worship, or any shall be obliged so to worship him, or not. But the *Consequent* is false; *Ergo*, So is the *Antecedent*. True Pastors have but the power to *promote*, and *order Gods worship*, but not to exclude, or forbid it to any (much less to all, or 1000.) without necessary cause.

2. And then if Preaching, and Hearing, and Sacraments, be ordinarily necessary to mens salvation, then God hath left it to the will, or power of the Bishops, whether any of the people shall be (ordinarily) saved. But that is not so.

2. And

3. And then if the King should license, or command us to Preach, Pray, and Communicate, and the Bishop forbid it, It were sin. But that I will not believe, unless the *Cause*, more than the *Authority*, make the difference.

To conclude, I hold, that *just use of the Keys* is very necessary, and that it is the great sin of *England* to reject it: But that a *false usurped use of excommunication* hath been the incendiary of the Christian world, which hath broken it to pieces, caused horrid Schisms, Rebellions, Treasons, Murders, and bloody Wars.

I. The just use is, 1. When a scandalous or great sinner is with convincing evidence told of his error, and with seriousness, yet with love and compassion, intreated to repent; and either prevailed with, and so absolved; or after due patience, Authoritatively pronounced incapable of Church-Communion, and bound over to answer it at the Bar of Christ, in terror if he repent not, and this by the Pastor of that particular Church, which either stately, or *pro tempore*, he belongeth to.

2. And when this is duly notified to such Neighbour-Pastors as he may seek Communion with, and they agree not to receive any justly cast out by others, but to receive and relieve the injured and falsely condemned.

3. And when the King and his Justices, permit not the excommunicated violently to intrude, and take the Sacrament, or joyn with the Church by force, but preserveth forcibly the Peace and Privileges of the Churches.

II. The excommunication that hath turned the Church into Factions, and undone almost *East* and *West*, is, 1. When a Bishop, because of his humane Superiory, as Patriark, Primate, or Pope, claimeth the power of excommunicating *other Bishops*, as his Subjects, whose Sentence must stand because of his Regent power.

2. Or at least, gathering a Council where he shall preside, and that Council shall take themselves to have a Governing power of the Keys over the particular Bishop, not only to renounce Communion with them themselves, but to oblige all others to stand to their judicial Sentence. 3. When Bishops shall meddle causelessly in other Bishops Churches, and make themselves Judges either of distant, unknown persons, and cases, or of such as they have nothing to do to try. Yea, judg men of other Coun-

Countries, or so distant, as the Witnesses and Causes cannot without oppression be brought to their Bar.

4. When they disgrace Gods universal Laws of Communion, as inefficient, and make a multitude of unnecessary, ensnaring, dividing Laws of their own, according to which they must be mens Judges.

5. When these Laws are not made only for their own flocks and selves, but for all the Christian world, or for absent, or dissenting persons.

6. When men excommunicate others for *hard words*, not understood, that deserve it not as to real matter.

7. Or do it to keep up an unlawful usurped power over those Churches that never consented to take them for their Pastors, and to rule where they have no true Authority but such as standeth on a forcing strength.

8. When Lay Chancellors use the Keys of the Church.

9. When men excommunicate others wickedly, for doing their duty to God and man, or unjustly without sufficient Cause.

10. When unjust excommunicators force Ministers against their Consciences to publish their condemnations against those that they know to be not worthy of that Sentence, if not the best of their flocks.

11. And when they damn all as Hereticks, Schismatics, &c. that communicate with any that they thus unjustly damn.

12. When they dishonour Kings, and higher Powers, by disgracing excommunications; much more when they depose them.

13. When they tell Princes, that it is their duty to banish, imprison or destroy men, because excommunicate, and not reconciled, and make Kings their Executioners. And so of old, when a Bishop was excommunicate, he must presently be banished: And they say, the Scots horning is of the same nature. If all had been either banished, or imprisoned, that were excommunicate, and unreconciled in the pursuit of the General Councils of old, how great a diminution would it have made of the office Subjects of the Empire? And if Princes must strike with the Sword, all that stand excommunicate, without trying, and judging the persons themselves, it is no wonder if such Prelates, that can first to debase them to be their Listors, can next depose them. He is like to be a great Persecuter, that will imprison or banish all that a proud contentious Clergy will excommunicate.

As *corruptio optimi est pessima*, I doubt not but a wise, humble, holy, spiritual, loving, heavenly, zealous, patient, exemplary sort of Pastors is the means of continuing Christs Kingdom in the World, and such are the *Pillars* and *Basis* of Truth in the House of God (as it is said of *Timothy*, not of the Church as is commonly mistaken). So an ignorant, worldly, carnal, proud, usurping, domineering, hypocritical sort of Pastors, have been the great plagues, and causes of Schism, confusion, and common calamity: And that when Satan can be the chuser of Pastors for Christs Church, he will (and too oft hath) ever chuse such as shall most successfully serve him in Christs Name.

And I doubt not, but such holy Discipline, as shall keep clean the Church of Christ, and keep off the reproach of wickedness and uncleanness from the Christian Religion, and manifest duty to the flock the difference between the precious and the vile, is a great Ordinance of God (which one man cannot exercise over many hundred Parishes, and unknown people). But an usurped domineering use of excommunication, to subdue Kings, Princes, Nobles, and people to the Jurisdiction, Opinions, and Canons of Popes, Patriarchs, Prelates, or their Councils, I think hath done not the least part of Satans work in the world.

And I must tell you, that I have lived now near 62. (now near 66.) years, and I never saw one man or woman reformed or converted by excommunication (and I hope I have known thousands converted from their sin by Preaching, even by some that are now forbidden to Preach). All that ever I knew excommunicate, were of two sorts. 1. Dissenters from the Opinions of the Bishops, or conscientious refusers of their commands: And these all rejoice in their sufferings, applying, *Blessed are ye, when they cast out your names, &c. say all evil of you falsely, &c.* or they take their censure for wicked persecution. The Papists laugh at their Excommunicators, and say, What an odd conditioned Church have you, that will cast us out that never came in, and because we will not come in? 2. Ungodly impenitent sinners: And these hate the excommunicators for disgracing them, and are driven further off from godliness than before: But they will say, *they repent* at any time, rather than go to the Gaol. I never saw one person brought to publick confession in the Assembly, by the Bishops Discipline; but I heard when

I was young, of one, or two, that for Adultery stood in a White Sheet in the Church, laughing at the sport, or hating the imposers. When there were no Bishops among us, about 1650. many Episcopal, Presbyterians, &c. agreed, where I lived, to exercise so much Discipline, as we were all agreed belonged to Presbyters. Hereupon I found good success, in bringing some to repentance by admonition, but never of any one that stood it out to an excommunication (so far as we went, which was only to admonish, and pray for their repentance publicly, and after to declare them unmeet for Christian Communion, and to require the people to avoid them accordingly, till they repent). After this they hated us more than before (and one of them laid hands on me in the Church-Yard, to have killed me). And I am sure that they revered those Ministers more than now Lay-Chancellors (if not Bishops) are by such revered: So that experience convinced me, that the penalty of excommunication is much more beneficial to others, than to the excommunicate.

And how many thousands in your Parish do now voluntarily excommunicate themselves from the Sacrament, and Church-Assemblies, and find no Remorse, or Reformation by it? And if all of both sorts (conscientious Dissenters, and prophane despisers, and sinners,) were excommunicated now by the Church of *England*, without any corporal penalty adjoyned, what do you think it would do upon them? Would they not laugh at you, or pity you? Do not the Bishops believe this, and therefore will not trust to their excommunications at all without the Sword?

I cannot magnifie the Discipline of such men as count themselves the Power of the Keys to be but a Leaden Sword, a vain thing, without the annexed enforcement of corporal penalties: If it be but *outward obedience to their commands*, which they drive men to, without the *heart*.

1. Men of no Conscience will soonest obey them, as forced against their Consciences.

2. And why do they abuse the name of the *Keys*, as if it were the cause of that which it is no cause of, but is done only by the Magistrates Sword? It is the Writ *De excom. cap.* that doth it, and not the Keys. And they that think *unwilling persons* have right to the great benefit of Church Communion;

yea,

yea, all that had rather come to Church than lie in God, shall never have my assent.

If really your meaning be to set up the power of the Keys by themselves, to do their proper work, and not expect that Magistrates must joyn their forcing power, to punish a man merely because he beareth the Bishops punishment patiently, without changing his mind; Let it prevail as far as it can prevail; who will fear it (save for the Schism that it may cause)? But if it be your meaning all this while; that under the name of *denying* the Sacrament, it is Confiscation (or the Gaol that must do the work, I should wishformore) of the Spirit of Christianity, and less inclination to the Inquisition way. Persecution never yet escaped its due odium, or penalty, by disowning its proper name. I am more of St. *Martin's* mind than of *Athanasius's*.

V. One word more I add, That I like not your making so light as you seem to me to do, of the *habit* of some Ministers and People that are in the allowed Church. I know that the Papists speak much of the holiness of a Pope, when perhaps a General Council saith, he is a Murderer, Adulterer, Heretick, &c. and so call their Church *Relatively* holy. I deny not that *Relative holiness*, which is founded in meer profession: But I believe, that Christ came to gather a people to another sort of *Godliness*, and by his Spirit to fill them with Divine and Heavenly *Life, Light, and Love* (to God and man). And I believe, that all that have this (though excommunicate) shall be glorified: And that without this, all the obedience to Bishops that they give, will never keep them out of Hell. And I take it to be no great priviledge to march in an orderly Army to damnation, or to be at peace in Satans power. Hell will be Hell which way ever we come to it. I confess, were these Bishops in the right, that *Santa Clara* citeth, that say, *The ignorant people might merit by hating God, as an act of obedience, if those Pastors should tell them it is their duty*; then this external obedience to them were more considerable: But I had rather go in the Company that goeth to Heaven (as all do that are true Lovers of God and man) than in that which goeth to Hell (as do the most Regular of them goeth). And yet *Attaine* true obedience, and regularity, a great duty of the godly, and a great help to godliness.

And therefore I value the *Means* for the *End*, *Concord* for *Peace* and *salvation*. And I cannot think, that there is not now in *London*, a very laudable degree of Concord among all those that, though in different Assemblies, and with difference of opinions about small matters, do hold one Body, one Spirit, one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one Celestial hope, and one God and Father of all, and live in Love, and Peace and Patience towards each other : This is far greater Concord than the thousands of people, that deserving excommunication for their wicked lives, do hold in the bosom of the Church, which receiveth them as children thereof. And O ! were it not for that uncharitable impatience, which an ill selfish Spirit doth contain, why should it seem to us a matter of such *odium*, envy, or out-cry, for men to hear the same Gospel from another man, which for some differing opinion they will not hear from us ? Or for men to communicate, *e. g.* standing, or sitting in a Congregation of that mind, that (weakly) scruple to kneel at it with others (the old Canons countenancing their gesture of standing, more than kneeling) What harm will it do me, if (under the strictest Laws of Peace) men worshipped God by themselves, that scruple some *word*, or *action* in our worship ? *E. g.* a *Nestorian* that should think, that it is improper to say, that the *Virgin Mary* was *Deus*, and that the denomination should be a *ratione formali*, rather than a *materiali* : Would Liberty in such matters, with Love and Peace, do more hurt to the Churches than Schismatical excommunications have done ?

And indeed it is hard to make people able to reconcile a Con-junct earnestness, in driving the same men *into the Church*, and *casting them out* ; yea, of excommunicating them, *ipso facto*, by divers Canons (*sine sententia*), and accusing them for not communicating. If it be for *not repenting*, 1. Can you bring all the sinners about us to repentance, by excommunications ? Why then are the openly wicked so numerous ? 2. Do you think men can change their judgment, merely because they are commanded, or excommunicated ? If a man study, and pray, and endeavour to the utmost, to know the truth, and you say, that yet he erreth, will a censure cure his understanding ? *E. g.* a *Nestorian*, a *Monothelite*, an *Anabaptist*, &c. much less when a man knoweth that he is in the right, and the censorer fighteth against truth and duty.

Men in some diseases will rage at the sight of certain things, which would not much trouble them, if the disease were cured. *Macedonius*, and *Nestorius*, that were judged Hereticks themselves, could not bear the Bishops, and meetings of the *Novatians*; But *Atticus* could, and they lived together in Christian Love. I know those places now in *England*, where a Conformable and Nonconformable Minister, live in so great love, and the latter go still to the Parish-Churches, and the former sometimes come to them, as that no considerable trouble ariseth by their difference: And I know other places, where the publick Ministers cannot bear any that hear not themselves, yea, or that constantly hearing them, hear any other that dissenteth. But they seek to win Dissenters, as Fowlers would bring Birds to the Net, by showing, and throwing stones at them; and Anglers would catch Fish, by beating the Waters.

VI. I will tell you also, that I much dissent from you, in that when I told you, *that the Tyranny of Prelates hath done more hurt than the disobedience and discord of the People towards them*, you said, *you do not think so*.

Qu. Do you think that Thieves have killed as many men as Wars have done? If it be true, that *Julius Caesar*, and his Armies killed 1192000. persons, besides those that he slew in the Civil Wars. That *Darius* lost at once 200 000, and abundance of such instances in lower degrees may be given; sure poor Thieves and Murderers come far short of this account. And so it is in the present case. *Gregory Nazian.* was a wise, and good man, who saith, the people were factious, and too unruly, but (at *Const.*) were honest, and meant well. But how sadly doth he describe the Bishops, as raging even in their Councils, and as the far greater causes of all calamity! Judge by the Twenty instances that I before gave you, about their excommunication: How few Heresies, or Schisms, were there of old, that the Bishops were not the notorious causes of? The *Samosatinians*, *Apollinarians*, *Macedonians*, *Nestorians*, *Acephali*, the *Monothelites*, yea, the *Donatists*, *Novatians*, the *Phantasists*, and almost all: The *Arrians* began by a Presbyter; but if *Petavius* cites them truly (as he doth) too many Bishops led him the way, and most of the Bishops followed, and were the men that kept up, and increased the Heresie, far beyond the people, or the Presbyters. *Eutychus*, a Monk, began his Cause; but he was quickly condemned by his followers, and did little.

little in comparison of *Dioscorus*, *Severus*, and many hundred more Bishops.

And is it the *People*, or the *Bishops*, that now keep *East* and *West* in mutual damnations? Have the *Peoples* divisions done more harm than the *Papal Schism*, and *Usurpations*, and *Cruelties*, killing about 2000000 as is said of *Albigenses* and *Waldenses*, the *Inquisitions*, bloody *Wars* against the *Germane Emperors*, and many *English Kings*, the *Rebellion* against the *Greek Emperor*, *Leo Isaurus*, and destruction of the *Eastern Empire*, our *Smithfield Boncfires*, and innumerable other *Cruelties*, *Desolations*, *Heresies* and *Schisms*? Are all these less than the abuse of *Liberty* by *Inferiors*, in *Praying*, *Preaching*, or *Disorders*? Judge *Hale* saith, *That he had a friend that stored a very great Pond of Three or Four Acres, with a great number of Fish, and at Seven years end only put in Two very small Pikes, and at the draught of his Pond, there was not one Fish left, but the Two Pikes grown to an excessive bigness, and all the rest with their millions of fry devoured by the pair of Tyrants. Hale of the Orig. of Man, Sect. 2. cap. 9. pag. 208. The Block had been a better Ruler. The Lord forgive the Presbyterians their over-keenness against Sects, before the Pikes have made an end of them. Pardon truth to*

Your Servant,

Ri. Baxter.

For the Learned Mr. Henry Dowell (after a personal Conference with him).

S. I. R.

CONCORD and PEACE are so very desirable to the ends of Christianity, that I am glad to hear you speak for them in the general, though I take your way to be certainly destructive of them; and because you think the like of mine, and so while we are agreed for the end, we greatly differ about the means, I shall here perform what I last offered you, viz. 1. An explication

tion of my own sense of the way of Church concord (because you said I am still upon the destructive part) viz. 1. My fundamental Principles. 2. The way of concord, which I suppose to be sufficient, and only likely (as appointed by God) to attain that end. II. The reasons of my utter dissent from your way. III. A Proposal for our further debating of these differences.

I. I hope if you are a man of charity or impartiality, it will be no hard matter to you to believe that I am willing to be acquainted with healing truth (that I say not as willing as you); and if I be unhappy in the success of my Enquiries, it is not for want of searching diligence. And your parts assure me, that it is so with you. But it is the usual effect of one received error, to let in many more; and it is so either with me or you. And lest it should prove my unhappiness, I shall thankfully accept your remedying informations.

1. The Principles which I presuppose, are such as these. 1. As God as Creator, so Christ as Redeemer is the Universal King and Head over all things to the Church, which is his body, *Ephes. 1. 22, 23. Joh. 17. 2, &c.*

2. He hath made *Universal Laws* to be means of this Universal Government.

3. His Universal Laws are in *quo genere* sufficient to their proper use.

4. There is no other Universal King or Ruler of the World, or of the Church, whether Personal or Collective. And therefore none that hath power of Universal Legislation, or Jurisdiction.

5. Much less any that hath a superiour power to alter Gods Universal Laws by abrogation, subrogation, suspension, or dispensation. Nor will God himself alter them, and substitute new ones. As *Tertullian* saith, *We at first believe this, that no more is to be believed.*

6. These Laws of our Universal Governour are partly of natural Revelation, and partly of Supernatural, viz. by himself, and by his Spirit in his Apostles given in an extraordinary measure to this end, to lead them into all truth, which is delivered to us in their Scripture-records.

7. Some local precepts, whose matter was narrow and temporary,

rary, even the mutable customs of that time and place were also narrow and temporary; (as the washing of feet, anointing, veiling women, the kisses of peace, &c.) which maketh nothing for the mutability of the Universal Laws.

8. No Pastors since the Apostles, are by office or power appointed to make any Universal Laws for the Church, nor any of the same kind and reason with Gods own Laws, whose reason or cause was existent in the Apostles times, but only to explain the word of God, and apply it to particular persons and cases, as Ministers under Christ in his Teaching, Priestly and Governing office; nor have the Apostles any other kind of Successors.

9. Christ made not *Peter* or any one of his Apostles Governor of the rest: But when they strove who should be the chief, rebuked that expectation, and determined, That among them Preeminence should consist in excelling in humility and service.

10. When the *Corinthians* were sick of the like disease, *Paul* rebuked them for saying, *I am of Cephas*, and determineth that Apostles are but particular members of the body, of which Christ only is the Head; and not the Lords, but Ministers and helpers of their faith.

11. No Pastors (as such) have forcing power, either to touch mens bodies, or estates, or inflict by the sword corporal penalties, or mulcts. But only by the word (by which the power of the Keys is exercised) to instruct men, and urge Gods precepts, promises and threats upon their Consciences.

12. The Apostles were Bishops *eminent*, in that they called, gathered, and while they stayed with them, governed Churches. But not *formaliter* as taking any one particular Church for their proper charge: But settled such fixed Bishops over them. And though they distributed their labours about the world prudently, and as the Spirit of Christ guided them; yet we find not any probability that ever they divided the world into twelve or thirteen Provinces, or ever settled twelve or thirteen chief Metropolitans seats in the world, which their proper Successors as such should govern in preeminence. Nor doth any History intimate such a thing; nor yet that any Apostle took any City for his proper Diocess, where another Apostle might not come and exercise equal Power.

13. It seemeth that Christs sending out his seventy Disciples by two and two; and the Apostles staying together much at *Jerusalem*, and *Paul* and *Barnabas's* going forth together, and after *Paul* & *Silas*, and *Barnabas* and *Mark*, & *Peter* and *Paul* (supposed) to be together at *Rome*, &c. that the Spirit of God did purposely prevent the intentions of any afterward of being the Metropolitall Successors of single Apostles or Disciples of Christs immediate sending, in this or that City as their proper seat.

14. As *Grotius* thinks that the Churches were instituted after the likeness of the Synagogues, of which one City had many; so Dr. *Hammond* endeavours to evince, not only that *Peter* and *Paul* were Bishops of two distinct Churches of *Rome*, one of the *Jews*, and the other of the Gentile Christians; but also that it was so in other Cities. *Dissertat.*

15. The Patriarchs were not 12 or 13, but three first, and five afterward; and none of them pretended to any power as especial Successors of any one Apostle, but *Antioch* and *Rome* of *Peter*; (and that was not their first claim or title, but an honorary reason why men afterward advanced them.) *Alexandria* claimed Succession but from St. *Mark*, and *Jerusalem* from *James* (no Apostle, if Dr. *Hammond* and others be not much mistaken) and *Constantinople* from none.

16. The 28 Canon of *Calcedon* tells us enough of the foundation, title and reason of Patriarchal power, and all Church-History that the Metropolitall Powers were granted by Emperours, either immediately, or empowering Councils thereto.

17. These Emperours having no power out of the Empire, neither by themselves, nor by Councils, gave not any power that extended further than the Empire, or that could by that title continue to any City which fell under the Government of another Prince.

18. As there never was a Council truly Universal, so the name *Universal* or *Oecumenical* was not of old given them, in respect to the whole *Christian world*, but to the whole Empire; as the power that called them, and the names of the Bishops subscribed, &c. fully prove.

19. Before Christian Princes did empower them, Councils were but for *Counsel*, *concord* and *correspondency*, and particular *Pastors* were bound by their Decrees only: 1. For the evidence of truth which they made known: 2. And by the *General Law*

of God, to maintain unity and peace, and help each other. But afterward, by vertus of the Princes Law, or Will, they exercised a direct Government over the particular Bishops, and those were oft banished that did not submit to them.

20. While Councils met but for *Counsel* and *Concord*, and also when afterward they were but *Provincial*, or *National* under Kings, where none of the *Patriarchal Spirit* and *Interest* did corrupt them, they made excellent Orders, and were a great blessing to the Churches: Of the first sort, e. g. were divers *African*, and of the latter divers *Spanish*, and *French*, when neither Emperor, nor Pope, did over-rule them, but the *Gothish*, and *French* Kings moderately govern them. But though I deny not any good which the Councils, called General, did, especially the first *Nicene*; yet I must profess, that the History of the Patriarchal Seats, and the History of the General Councils, and the Church-Wars then, and after them managed by Four of the Patriarchs especially, and their Bishops, the confusion caused in most of the Churches, the Anathematizing of one another, the blood that hath been shed in the open streets, of Monks and common people; yea, the fighting, and fury of Bishops at the Councils, to the death of some of them, their tiring out the endeavours of such Emperors, and their Officers, that would have kept Peace and Concord among them, do all put me out of hope, that the Peace and Concord of the Christian world, should ever be settled by Popes, Patriarchs, or such kind of *Councils*, which all have so long filled the Christian world with most calamitous divisions, contentions, and blood-shed, and made the snares, which continue its divisions and distractions to this day.

II. I conceive, that the means of Church-concord, appointed by God, is as follows. But I premise,

1. It must be pre-supposed, That no perfect Concord will be had on earth; yea, that there will unavoidably be very many differences, which must be born. So great is the diversity of mens natural Capacity and Temper, their Education, Company, Teachers, Helps, Interests, Callings, Temptations, &c. that it is not probable that any Two men in all the world, are

in

in every particular of the same mind : And every man that groweth in knowledg, will more and more differ from himself, and not be of the same mind as he was when he knew less.

2. Yet must our increase in knowledg, and Concord, be our continual endeavour ; and it is the use of teaching to bring these differences, caused by ignorance, to as small a number as we can.

3. There is scarce a more effectual means of Division, and Confusion, and Church-ruin, to be devised, than to suppose a more extensive Concord to be possible, and necessary, than indeed is ; and so to set up an impossible End, and Means, and to deny Concord and Peace to all that cannot have it on those terms. If all should be denied to be the Kings Subjects, who dare not profess Assent, Consent, and approbation of *every law*, and *part*, or *word* of the laws, or that agree not of the *meaning* of every law, or that differ in any matters of Religion, what a Schism, Confusion, and Ruine would it unavoidably make in the Kingdom ? and how few Subjects would it leave the King ? Even as if none but men of the same stature, visage, or wit, should be Subjects.

4. The necessary Union and Concord of Christians, is a matter of so great importance, that it cannot be supposed, that Christ is the sole Universal Lawgiver, and yet hath not ordained, or determined what shall be the terms of necessary Christian Unity and Concord : And indeed he hath determined it. *Viz.*

I. He hath ordained Baptism himself, to be our Christning, or our visible Investiture in the Church Universal ; that is, our Relation to Christ, as the Head of his Universal Kingdom, or Body. And every rightfully baptized person (till by violating that Covenant he forfeit his benefits), is to be taken by us as a Member of Christ, a Child of God, and an Heir of Heaven ; and we are bound to love him as a brother, and use him accordingly, in all due Offices of Love. And because the Church, into which Baptism entereth us, consists of Christian Pastors and People, Apostles and Prophets, having been as *Foundations*, infallibly delivering us, now recorded in Scripture the Word of Life ; and ordinary Pastors being appointed to *teach*, and *guide* the people in *holy Doctrine, Worship, and Conversation* ; therefore it is implied, that the baptized person at Age,

understandeth this, and consenteth thereunto; that is, to receive, as infallible, the recorded sacred Doctrine of the infallible persons, Apostles and Prophets, and the ordinary Ministry of such ordinary Pastors and Teachers, as he shall discern to be set over him by the Word and Spirit of Christ. Whether this consent to the Pastoral-Office, be necessary to the *Being* of a *Christian*, or only to the *Well-being*, is a controverſie with which I need not ſtop, or lengthen this account. But Baptiſm, as ſuch, doth not enter us into any *particular Church*.

II. 1. Chriſt (by himſelf, and his Spirit in the Apoſtles) hath ordained; that Chriſtians ſhall be associated into particular Churches, conſiſting of the aforeſaid Ordinary Paſtors and their Flocks, for *Perſonal Communion* in holy Doctrine, Worſhip, and Converſation; in all which theſe Paſtors are their Guides, according to the *Laws, or Word of Chriſt, already delivered* by the infallible Miniſtry of the Apoſtles and Prophets; *againſt, or beyond* which, Chriſt hath given them no power. Their Office is of his own making, and deſcribing; and their power to determine undetermined uſeful circumſtances in Gods Worſhip, and Church-diſcipline, is but a power to obey Chriſts general commands (to do all things in Love, Peace, Order, Decency, and to Edification), which they may not violate.

2. Every Chriſtian that hath opportunity, ſhould be a Member of ſome ſuch particular Church; Statedly, if it may be; if not, yet *transiently*: But ſome may want ſuch opportunity (as ſingle perſons converted, or caſt among Infidels; Travellers, Embaſſadors, Factors, and other Merchants, (among Infidels) or where Chriſtianity is ſo corrupted by the Paſtors, as that they will not allow men Communion without ſinful Oaths, Covenants, Profeſſions, Words, or Practices.

3. No one at Age can be a Member of the Univerſal, or of any *particular Church* (and ſo the Subject of that Paſtor) againſt *his will*, or *without his own conſent* (however Antecedent Obligations may bind men to conſent).

4. Every ſuch Church ſhould have its proper Biſhop; and in *Ignatius's* time, its Unity was deſcribed by *One Altar, and One Biſhop, with his fellow Presbyters, and Deacons*.

5. Such Biſhops, or Paſtors, were to be ordained by *Senior Biſhops, or Paſtors*, and received by the Election, or Conſent of the whole Church; and for many hundred years no Churches

They received their Bishops on any other terms. The *Ordainers*, and the *People or Church receiving* him, having each a necessary consent, as a double Key for the security of the Church; to which afterwards the Christian Magistrates consent was added according to Gods word, so far as protecting and countenancing of the Bishop did require. The *senior* Bishops must consent to his *Ordination*, the *people* must consent to him as *formally related to themselves as their Pastor*; and the Magistrate as to one to be protected by him.

6. As without *mutual consent* the relation of Pastor and flock is not founded; To *Gods Providence* must direct every man to know what particular Church he should be of, and whom by consent to take for the guide of his soul. In *England* men may freely chuse what Church and Pastor they will stand related to; every man having liberty to dwell in what Parish or Diocese he please, without asking leave of the Bishop to remove.

7. The individuating or distinguishing of *particular Churches* by peculiar Circuits, or proper spaces of ground, is no further of Gods institution, than it is the performance of the general commands of doing all in order to *edification, &c.* And as in prosperous times under godly peaceable Princes, it is greatly convenient and desirable; so in several cases of Division, Church-corruption by Heresie, or Tyranny, Persecution, &c. it is inconvenient, and it becomes a necessary duty to gather Churches in the same space of ground where only some other Pastor had a Church before. The cases in which this is lawful, and the cases in which Separation is unlawful, having written largely in another paper, I shall offer it to you when you desire it.

8. It is not of absolute necessity that all the members of a particular Church, do always or usually meet in one place, (though it be very convenient and desirable where it may be done); for Persecution may prohibit it, or want of a large capacious place, or the great distance of some of the Inhabitants, or the age, or weakness of others; and therefore in the ancient Churches, though at first they usually were all assembled in one place, yet after when they encreased, the Canons required all the people to assemble with the Bishop but at certain chief Festivals in the year, having Chappels or Oratories in the Villages where they met on other days. And with us many Parishes of great extent have many Chappels of ease.

9. But

9. But that the end of the Association be not only for *distant communion* by *Delegates* or *Letters*, or meer relation to one common Ruler as all the Empire had to the Emperour, but for **PERSONAL COMMUNION** of Pastor and Flock, so that they may at least *per vices* meet together, or live within the reach of each others personal notice, and converse, and Communion in Doctrine, Worship and Discipline, this is essential to a *particular Church, primi ordinis*, of Divine Institution, of which I now treat.

III. 1. As Christians must gather into particular Churches, under their proper Bishops; so *these Churches* must hold a certain Communion among themselves, so much as is necessary to their mutual Edification and Preservation, of which Synods, and Communicatory Letters and Messengers, are the means.

2. An association of several Churches for *Communion of Churches*, doth *tota specie* differ from an association of individual Christians into one Church *prima speciei*. And it differeth in the *matter, end*, and kind of Communion.

3. If these several Churches agree in the same Baptismal Covenant, in the same ancient *Creed or Articles of Faith*, and in the same love and holy desires summed up by Christ in the Lords-prayer, and in taking the commands of Christ for the Rule of their conversation, and receiving *Gods Revelations* recorded in the holy Scriptures so far as they understand them, renouncing all contraries to any of this so soon as they perceive them so to be, this should suffice to their loving and comfortable communion, without any desires of Domination or Government over one another. And though I will not do any thing unpeaceably against Patriarchs, Metropolitans, Archbishops or Diocelans, if they govern according to the Laws of God; yet I know no Divine right that any of them have to be the Rulers of the particular Bishops and Churches. Though a humane presidency for order we deny not, nor that *junior* Bishops do owe some respect and submission to the Seniors.

4. Though the *General Laws of Christ* (for *concord, edification, &c.*) do enable Magistrates by command, or Pastors by contract to chuse and make new Officers of their own (which God ne-

never particularly instituted) for the determining and executing such *circumstantials* as God hath left to humane prudence, (as *Presidents, Moderators, Churchwardens, Summoners, &c.*) yet I deny, 1. That any Officer of *meer humane Institution* hath a superior proper Ecclesiastical *Power of the Keys*, to be a *Bishop* of *Bishops*, and to govern the Governours of the particular Churches by Excommunications, Depositions, and Absolutions, seeing *ex ratione rei*, it belongeth to the same Legislator, who instituted the *inferiour order*, to have instituted the *Superiour*, if he would have had it. 2. And I peremptorily deny that any such pretended Superiour (Patriarch, Primate, Metropolitan, Archbishop, &c.) hath any power (save Diabolical) to deprive any *particular Churches, Bishops, or Christians*, of any of the *Priviledges* settled on them by *Christ's Universal Laws*, or to disoblige them from any duties required by Christ.

IV. It belongeth to the Office of Princes and Magistrates only to Rule all, both Clergy and Laity, by the *sword or force*; even to drive Ministers to do their certain duty, and to punish them for sin. And they are to keep peace among the Churches; and (as bad as the Secular Powers have been) had they not kept peace better than the Bishops have done, I am posselt with horror to think what a field of blood the Churches had been throughout the world, since the Exaltation of the Clergy.

V. Christ only is (as the Universal Legislator, so) the Universal final Judg, from whom there is no appeal.

VI. Every Christian as a Rational Agent hath a Judgment of discerning, by which he must judg whether his Rulers commands be according to Christ's commands or not. And if they be, must obey Christ in them. If not, must not obey them against Christ, but appeal to him. And if any do this erroneously, it is his sin; if justly, it is his duty.

These six Particulars I take to be the sufficient means which Christ hath appointed for the concord of the Church; and that the seven points of Concord mentioned by the Apostle should satisfie us herein, *viz.* 1. One body. 2. One Spirit. 3. One hope of our calling. 4. One Lord. 5. One Faith. 6. One Baptism. 7. One God and Father of all. And they that agree in these, are bound to keep the Unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace; as knowing that the Kingdom of God consisteth not in meats and drinks, but in Righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Ghost.

And

And he that in these serveth Christ, is acceptable to God, and (should be) approved of men, *Rom.* 14. 17, 18. *Ephes.* 4. 6, 7, &c. Nor is it lawful for any to hate, persecute, silence, or Excommunicate their Brethren that agree in these; or to divide, distract, or confound the Churches for the interest of their several Preeminences, or Provinces, which have no higher than humane authority, perhaps questionable, at least unquestionably below the authority of God, and *null* when it is *against* it.

I am sure by the Church-History of all ages since Christ, the great divider of the Christian World hath been the *Pride* of a *worldly* (too ignorant) Clergy.

1. Striving who should be *greatest*.
2. Striving about *ambiguous words*.
3. Imposing *unnecessary things* by their Authority upon the Churches; to be ignorant of this, is impossible to me when once I have read the History of the Church; which warneth me what to suspect as the causes of our distractions; for the things that had been, are.

And how unexcusable these three evils, and how contrary to Christ, these Texts do tell me: I. *Luk.* 22. 24, 25, 26. I *Pet.* 5. 1, 2, 3, 4. I *Cor.* 3. 5, 6, 7, 22. 2 *Cor.* 1. 24. II. 2 *Tim.* 2. 14, 16, 23, 24, 25. I *Tim.* 1. 4, 5, 6. III. 2 *Cor.* 11. 3. *Act.* 15, 28. *Revel.* 2. 24, 25. *Mat.* 15. 8, 9. *Rom.* 14, & 15, throughout.

To tell you, that I am not only as you say, on the *destructive* part, I have thus told you briefly what I assert as the way to peace. And now I shall *destructively* tell you why I differ from your Principles as truly *destructive of truth, unity and peace*.

Some of the Principles which I have heard from your mouth, which I dissent from, are these:

I. That the Church must have some Ecclesiastical Governours that are absolute, from whom no man may appeal to an invisible Power.

II. That Diocesan Churches are the first in order of Divine Institution.

III. That Diocesan Bishops by consent may make other Church-forms, as National, Patriarchal, &c. And that such Churches are not made by Princes, but by the consent of Prelates.

IV. That these Church-forms of mans making, stand in a Governing

verning Superiority over those of Gods making.

V. That where by such consent of Diocesans such superior Jurisdictions are once settled, it is a sin for any to gather Assemblies within the local bounds of their Jurisdiction without their consent.

VI. That you cannot see how those that do so, can be saved.

VII. That if I preach on the account of my Ministerial office, and the peoples necessity, to such as else would have no Preaching, nor any publick worship of God, (v.g. in a Parish where there are 40000 more than can hear in the Parish-Church), though I must conclude that according to the ordinary way of Salvation such could not be brought to Faith, Holiness and Salvation, for want of teaching, it is yet my sin to preach to them, and my duty to let them rather be damned, if I have not the Bishops consent to teach them; and that because it is the Bishop and not I that shall answer for their damnation.

VIII. That it is disputable with you whether those to whom Church power is given (*viz.* Diocesans) may not change (not only the local temporary circumstances, but) the very Church-forms, and suspend Laws of Christ.

IX. That Baptism entreith the Baptized into some particular Church, and consequently under this fore-described Church-Government.

X. That in the case of Preaching the Gospel, Ministers may in many cases do it, though Emperours and Kings forbid them, (as in the days of *Constantius*, *Valens*, yea and better men); but not if the Bishop forbid them, or consent not.

XI. That *circa Sacra*, if the King command the Churches for Uniformity, one Translation of the Bible, one Version or Meter of the Psalms, one Liturgy, one Time, or Place of Worship, &c. and the Bishop another, we ought to obey the Bishop against the command of the King.

XII. That the required Subscriptions, Declarations, Rubricks and Canons, are primarily the Laws of the Church, which the King and Parliament do confirm by their Sanction; and therefore the Church is the Expounder of them.

These are some of your Assertions, which I cannot yet receive.

1. My Reasons against the first are these: 1. Because this maketh *Gods* of men, and so is Idolatry, giving them Gods proper Power and Prerogative.
2. Yea; it taketh down God (or his Laws), and setteth them above him: For there cannot be two *Absolute Governors* that have not *one Will*. If I must not appeal from them to God, then I must appeal from God to them; that is, I must break his Law, if they bid me, or else they are not *Absolute*.
3. This maketh all Gods Laws at the will of man, as alterable, or dispensible: Man may forbid all that God commandeth, and I must obey.
4. Then all Villanies may be made Virtues, or Duties, at the will of man: If they command us to curse God, or Blaspheme, or be perjured, or commit Fornication, Murder, or Idolatry, it would become a Duty.
5. Then the Power, and Lives of Kings would be at the Clergies mercy; For if their power be *Absolute*, they may make Treason and Rebellion a Duty.
6. And all Family Societies, and Civil Converse, might be overthrown, while an *Absolute Clergy* may disoblige men from all duty to one another.
7. Then the Council at *Lateran*, which you have excellently proved in your *Considerations*, to be the Author of its Canons, doth, or did oblige Princes to exterminate their Reformed Subjects, and disoblige Subjects from their Allegiance to Princes that obey not the Pope herein, and are excommunicate. So of *Greg. 7th's Council. Rom.*
8. Then did the Church, or Kingdom of *England* well, to disobey, or forsake the *Roman Power*, that was over them?
9. Were not our Martyrs rather Rebels, that died for disobeying an *Absolute Power*?
10. How should two contradicting *Absolute Powers* (*viz.* General Councils) be both obeyed? *E. g. Nioen. 1. and Arimin. Sines. and Tyr. or Ephes. 2. and Calced.*
11. How will this stand with the Judgment and practice of the Apostles, that said, *Whether it be meet that we obey God, or man, judge ye?*

12. How

12. How will it stand with Conformity to the Church of England, that in the Articles saith, that General Councils may err, and have erred in matter of Faith? &c.

13. Is it not against the sense of all mankind, even the common Light of Nature, where utter Atheism hath not prevailed?

Say not, that I wrong you, by laying all this *odium* on your self. I lay it but on your words: And I doubt not, but (though disputing Interest draw such words from you) on consideration you will re-call them by some limitations.

II. My Reasons against your second, must pre-suppose, that we understand one another as to the sense of the word, *Diocesan Church*, which being your term, had I been with you, I must have desired you first to explain. The word, *Diocesis* of old, you know, signified a part of the Empire, larger than a Province, and that had many *Metropolitans* in it. I suppose that is not your sense. Sometimes now it is taken for that space of ground which we call, a Diocesis; sometimes for all the people in that space. And with us, a Diocesan Church, is a Church of the lowest Order, containing in it, a multitude of fixed Parochial Congregations, which have every one their stated *Presbyter*, who is no Bishop, and *Unum altare*, and are no Churches, but parts of a Church, and which is individuated by one Bishop, and the measuring-space of ground, whose inhabitants are its Members. Till you tell me the contrary, I must take this for your sense; For you profess to me, that you speak of such Diocesan Churches as ours (and they have some above a thousand, others many hundred Parishes); and you say our Parishes are not Churches, but Parts of a Church, and so Families are.

2. Either you mean, that a *Diocesan Church* is the first in order of Execution and Existence, or else in order of Intention, and so last in Existence and Execution. I know not your meaning, and therefore must speak to both.

1. That a Diocesan Church is first in Intention, is denied by me, and disproved (though it belong to you to prove it).

1. *Intentions* no where declared of God in mature or supernatural Revelations, are not to be asserted of him as Truths. But a *prime intention* of a *Diocesan Church* is no where declared of God: *Ergo*, not to be asserted of him as truth.

2. It is the *end* or *ultimum rei complementum*, which is first in *intention* (where there is *ordo intentionis*.) But a *Diocesan Church* is not the *end* or *ultimum rei complementum*: *Ergo*, not first intended.

The Major is not deniable: The Minor hath the consent as far as know, of all the world. For they are all either for the Hierarchy, or against it. They that are for it, say that a *Metropolitan* is above a *Diocesan*, and a *Provincial* above a *Metropolitan*, and a *Patriarchal* above a *Provincial*, and a *National* (which hath Patriarchs, as the Empire had) above that; and say the new-Catholics, an *humane universal* above a *National Church*, as the complement or perfection; and therefore must be first intended.

But those that are against the Hierarchy, think that all these are Church-corruptions, or humane policies set up by Usurpation, and therefore not of prime Divine Intention.

3. If you should go this way, I would first debate the question with you, how far there is such a thing as *ordo intentionis* to be ascribed to God. For though St. Thomas (as you use to call him) assert such *intentions*, it is with many limitations; and others deny it, and all confess that it needeth much Explication to be understood.

II. But if it be a priority of *Existence* in order of execution that you mean, it disproveth it self. For,

1. It is contrary to the nature of production; that two, or twenty, or an hundred stated Congregations, should be *before one*; as it is that I should write a page before a line, and a line before a word, and a word before a letter.

2. It is contrary to the Scripture-History, which telleth us that Christ called his Disciples by degrees, a few first, and more after; and that the Apostles accordingly converted men; from the number of 120, they rose to 3000 more; and after to 5000, &c. And that ordinarily the Churches in Scripture-times were such as *could*, and often did meet in one place, (though that be not necessary as I said before) hath so copious evidence, as that I will not here trouble you with it.

3. Either the Apostles Ordained Bishops before subject Presbyters, or such Presbyters before Bishops, or both at once. If both at once as two Orders, it's strange that they called both Orders promiscuously by the same names, sometimes Bishops, sometimes Presbyters, and sometimes Pastors and Teachers, without any distinguishing Epithere or notice. And it's strange that we never find any mention of the two sorts of Congregations, one the Bishops Cathedral, and the other the Parish Presbyters Congregation. If you say that they were the Bishops themselves, and first Ordained only subject-Presbyters under them, that cannot hold. For doubtless there were more than twelve or thirteen Churches (the number of Apostles in their times; nor were they fixed Bishops, but indefinite gatherers and edifiers of the Churches. And either those Elders first Ordained by the Apostles were Bishops, or else there were Churches without Bishops, for they Ordained Elders in every City, and in every Church. And either the Elders first Ordained by the Apostles had the power of Ordaining others, or not. If they had, then either they were Bishops, or else subject-Presbyters were Ordained to be Ordainers; yea to Ordain Bishops (if such were to be after ordained.) And so indeed it would be suitable to your conceit, that the inferiour order of Diocesans do by consent make superior Metropolitans, Provincials, Nationals, and Patriarchs to rule them; and with Hieromes report *ad Evagr.* that the *Alexandrian* Presbyters made the Bishops, as the Army doth a General. But this making of Children to beget Fathers, is so commonly denied, that I need not more dispute against it.

3. But I think most of the Hierarchical way will say, that the Apostles first Ordained Bishops, that those Bishops might Ordain subject-Presbyters. And if so, the Churches could be but single Congregation at the first till the subject-Presbyters were Ordained. Yea, Dr. Hammond (as aforesaid) asserteth (in *Act. 11.* and in *Dissert. &c.*) that there is no proof there were any of the Order of subject-Presbyters in Scripture-times; and he thinketh that most of his party were of his mind; and that the name Bishop, Elder and Pastor in Scripture signifie only those that we now call Bishops. And in this he followeth *Dion. Petavius*, and *Fr. a Sancta Clara de Episcop.* who saith that it came from *Scotus*. And if this be so, then in all Scripture-times there was no Church of more than one worshipping Congregation. For we are agreed that Church.

Church-meetings were for the publick Worship of God, and celebration of Sacraments, and exercise of Discipline, which no meer Lay-man might lawfully guide the people in, and perform as such assemblies did require. And one Bishop could be but in one place at once. And if there were *many Bishops*, there were many Churches. So that according to Dr. *Hammond* and all of his mind, there was no Church in Scripture-times of more than one stated ordinary Worshipping Congregation, because there were no subject-Presbyters.

If you say that yet this was a *Diocesan Church*, because it had a Diocesan Bishop; I answer, why is he called a Diocesan Bishop if he had not a Diocesan Church?

If you mean that he was designed to turn his single Congregation into many by increase: 1. That must not be *said only*, but *proved*. 2. And that supposeth that his *one congregation* was first before the *many*. And I hope you take not *Infidels* for parts of the Church, because they are *to be converted* hereafter. Those that are no members of the Church make not the Church, and so make it not to be Diocesan. One Congregation is not an *hundred* or a *thousand*, because so many will be hereafter.

If you mean that such a *space of ground* was assigned to the Bishops to gather and govern Churches in. I answer,

1. Gathering Churches is a work antecedent to Episcopacy.
2. The *Ground* is no part of the Church. It is a Church of *men*, and not of *soil* and houses that we speak of.
3. Nor indeed will you ever prove that the Apostles measured out or distinguished Churches by the space of ground. So that the first Churches were not Diocesan.

III. As to your Third Opinion, 1. Officers are denominated from the work which they are to do. There are works to be done, *circa sacra*, about the holy Ministerial works, as Accidental; as to see to Church buildings, Utensils, and Lands, to Summon Synods, and Register their Acts; to moderate in disputations, and to take votes, &c. These the Magistrate may appoint Officers to perform; and if he do not, the Churches, by his permission, may do it by consent.

And

And there are works proper to the Magistrate, *viz.* to force men to their duty by mulcts; or corporal penalties. I deny none of these.

But the works of *Ordination, Pastoral Guidance, Excommunication, and Absolution*, by the power of the Keys, are proper to the sacred Office, which Christ hath instituted. And I shall not believe, till I see it proved, that any men have power to make any new Order, or Office of this sort, which Christ never made by himself, or his Spirit in his Apostles; much less that *Inferiors* may make *Superior Offices*: For 1. It belongeth to the same power to make one (especially the Superior) Church Office, which made the other of the same General nature. If without Christs institution, no man could be *Episcopus gregis*, and have the power of the Keys over the people, then by parity of Reason, without his institution no man can be *Episcopus Episcoporum*, and have the power of the Keys over the Bishops.

2. Dr. Hammond's argument against Presbyters Ordination is, *Nemo dat quod non habet*; which though it serve not his turn on several accounts (both because 1. *They have* the Order which they confer. 2. Because *Ordination* is not *giving*, but *Ministerial delivery* by *Investiture*); yet in this case it will hold; For 1. This is supposed to be a new institution of an Office. 2. And that of an higher power than ever the Institutors had themselves: The King giveth all his Officers their power; but all of them cannot give the King his power. The Patriarch cannot make a Pope; nor the *Metropolitans* a Patriarch, that shall have a power over them, which they never had themselves.

And what I say of Superior Orders, and Offices, I say of Synods; For whether the power be Monarchical, or Aristocratical, or Democratical; there is need of the same power in the Cause that maketh it: No man can give that which he hath not to give.

If you should fly to such popular Principles, as the Episcopal Champion, *Richard Hooker*, doth, and the Jesuites in their Politicks, and many; yea, most other Writers of Politicks, and say, That as the people are the givers of power to the Sovereign, though they are no Governours themselves, so the Bishops give power to the *Episcopi Episcoporum* (personal, or Synodical), I answer, The Principle is false about *Civil Policy*, as I have

I have proved against Mr. *Hooker*, in my *Christian Directory*, and as Dr. *Hammond* hath proved in the Kings Cause, against *John Goodwin*. The power every man hath over himself, doth so specifically differ from the power of Governing-Societies, that the latter is not caused by all mens Contribution of the former; and much more in Church-Government, which God hath left lets the Will of man (as Mr. *Dan. Cawdray* hath proved).

To conclude, I grant the Superiority of Magistrates, and of their Officers, *circa sacra*, but not that Inferior Clergymen may by consent, make a Superior Species of Rulers (or *Episcopus Episcoporum*) by the Keys, *in eodem genere*.

But I confess, that how far *Christ himself* hath made *Apostolick Successors*, or *Archbishops*, as to the ordinary part of governing many Churches, is a question to me of much more difficulty, and moment.

As for the Patriarchal, and other Superior Church-power in the *Roman Empire*, that it was made partly by the Emperors themselves (as the instances of the two *Justiniana's*, and many others shew), and partly by Councils, Authorized thereto by the Emperors, is past all doubt.

IV. As to your fourth Opinion, I include the reason of my denial of it, in the description of it. Whether you confess particular worshipping Churches, that have each *unum altare*, to be of *Divine Institution*, I cannot tell: but that you take the *Dioecelan* to be so *Divine*, you have told me; and that you take the Superior Ruling-Churches, to be made by them. Now that Churches of *mans making* (Universal, or National, or Patriarchal, &c.) should be the rightful Governors (by the Keys) over the Churches of *Gods making*, must be either *jure Divino*, or *humano*: not *jure humano*; For 1. Man cannot give the power of the Keys without God. 2. And mans grant cannot over-top Gods. Indeed there is no power but of God.

2. Not *jure divino*; For if God give them the power, God maketh that Species that containeth that power. For God not to make the Office, and not to give the power, is all one.

3. At least, what satisfying proof you will give us, that indeed God giveth power to Church-Officers of his own making, themselves

sevesto make *nobler superior Officers* or Churches than themselves, I cannot foresee. And till it's proved, it is not to be believed.

4. Yea it confoundeth the Inferiours and the Superiors. For the Diocesans are so far the Superiors to the Provincial, National, Patriarchal, &c. in that they make them, or give them their power, and yet inferior in that they are to be subjects to them.

More *Nonconformists* do deny the power of *men* to make new *Species* of Churches, and Church Rulers, than their power to make new Ceremonies.

V. Your next mention'd Opinion, (that it is a sin to preach and congregate people within the local bounds of Diocesan or Provincial, or other superior Jurisdictions without their consent) falleth of it self, if those foregoing fall, which it is built upon:

1. If it prove true that they that made these superior Jurisdictions had no power to make them, but gave that which they had not to give, then your foundation faileth.

2. If it be proved that neither Christ nor his Apostles ever made a Law that Bishops Jurisdictions shall be limited, measured and distributed by space of ground, as our Parishes and Diocesses are, so that all in such a compass shall be proper to one Pastor, much less did ever divide our Diocesses or Parishes; (which methinks none should deny) then Preaching in that space of ground is no sin against such an Order of Christ.

3. If it be proved (as I undertake to do) that this distribution by spaces of ground, is a work that the King and his Officers are to do, (or the Churches by his permission by way of contract, if he leave it to them), and this in obedience to Gods General Laws (of Order, Peace, Concord and Edification), then these things will follow,

1. That if the King give us Licenses to Preach within such a space of ground, we have good Authority, and break not the restraining Law: And yet such as you accused us of schism as well when the King Licensed us, as since.

2. That this Law of local bounds doth bind us but as other humane laws do; which is, say many Casuists, not at all out of the case of scandal, when they make not for the *bonum publicum*.

But say others more safely, not when they notoriously make against, 1. Either the *bonum publicum*, which is *finis regiminis*: 2. Or the general Law of God which must authorize them, (being against edification, peace, &c.) 3. When they are contrary to the great, certain and indispensable Laws of God himself. And that in such cases patient suffering the penalty which men inflict is instead of obedience to the prohibition, (and as in *Daniel's case*, *Dan. 6* and the Apostles, &c.)

Therefore I am ready to give you, 1. My Concessions in what cases it is sinful to disobey the Magistrate in Preaching where he forbiddeth it: 2. And in what cases it is a great duty. But to say that it is a sin because that the Clergy forbiddeth it, must have better proof than I have seen, even, 1. That such Clergymen are truly called by God. 2. And that they have from him the assignation of this spare of ground. And 3. are by him empowered to forbid all others to preach on their land. 4. And that even when Gods general Laws do make it our duty, that they can suspend the obligation of such Laws, even the greatest: I am ready upon any just occasion to prove to you, that I were a heinous sinner, if I should have ceased such Preaching as I have used upon all the reasons that you alledg against it. And would then that make our *greatest* and *dearest* duties to pass for sin, and our greatest sin, *Isa. 5. 20*. Were it but one of the *least* commands, I would be loth to break it, and *teach men so to do*, much less one of the *greatest*; when men whose consciences tell them, that they are totally devoted to God; as Christians and as Ordained Ministers, deny their worldly interest and preferments, and serve him in poverty, beholden for their daily bread, and to the ruin of their worldly Estates, and the hazard of their lives in the Common Goals, endeavour nothing but to Preach Christs Gospel to save mens souls from ignorance, unbelief, sensuality, worldliness, &c. in case of the peoples undeniable necessity, I say, when such meet with men of the same profession, who think not the Common Goals among Rogues, and the forfeiture of Forty pound a Sermon, as Enacted by Law, to be enough to restrain them, but also as in the name of Christ they will charge us with heinous sin unless we will perfidiously break our obligations to Christ, and sacrilegiously alienate our selves from the work which we are devoted to (many of us under the Bishops hands) and unless we will be cruel to miserable souls, and shut up

up the bowels of our compassion, from them, while we see them in need and in danger of damnation, what fortitude do we need against such kind of Tempters, and such Temptations? If Drunkards and boys in the street only scorn'd me as a Puritan, or Precisian, it were less. If *Turkish* Rulers did persecute me for my Preaching Christ, it were less. If mistaken Christian Rulers made me the scorn of the Nation, and stript me of all my worldly maintenance, and laid me with Malefactors in Prisons, it were a less temptation, than for a man to come in the name of Christ, to tell me that I sin against him, unless I will forsake my Calling, break my Vows, cease Preaching his Gospel, betray thousands of souls to Satan and damnation, and encourage all that endeavour it by yielding to all their temptations, and giving them success. But as Christ must be accused of sin, as well as crucified, and not allowed the honour of suffering as innocent, so must his servants.

I will venture upon one argument on the by that may be somewhat by others, though nothing to you for the invalidating of your accusation. I saw from the hands of a Noble Lord, an excellent truly The Earl of Orry. Learned Manuscript said by him to be the Bishop of *Lincolns*, to falsifie you who are said to judg it unlawful to subscribe to *Athanasius's* Creed. What else you refuse I know not; but by that much I perceive you are a strange kind of *Nonconformist*. Now if it be unlawful for *you* to subscribe and conform, or unlawful for *me*, (which I here undertake to prove before any equal competent Judges) then it is unlawful for all the Ministers of *England*; for none of them may do evil that good may come by it. And then all the Ministers in *England* ought to cease Preaching, if I ought to cease, when they are forbidden. The consequence will be denied by others, though not by you. (And by the way, How can you take the Bishops for Absolute, from whom there is no appeal to an invisible power, and yet disobey them, if they bid you subscribe *Athanasius* Creed.) If it be a sin in me not to cease Preaching when I am silenced for Nonconformity, and yet Nonconformity be a duty, then it is a sin in all the Ministers of *England* not to be Nonconformists, and so not to cease Preaching. But the latter part of the consequent is false: *Ergo*, so is the Antecedent.

2. Yea, directly your assertion puts it in the power of one superior to put down the Preaching of the Gospel, and all Gods publick Worship, in whole Countries or Kingdoms, (if not in the world), and so Christ must be at their mercy whether he shall have any

any Church, and so whether he shall be Christ; and God, whether he shall have any publick Worship. In *Ethiopia* (though *Brierwood* saith that yet after the decay of the *Abassine* Empire, it is as big as *Italy, Germany, France* and *Spain*) they have but one Bishop, called their *Abuna*. And if he forbid all Preaching or publick Worship in the Empire, it is a sin to obey him. And it is a great duty to gather Churches within his Church. It is a sin in the Empire of *Muscovie*, that all their Clergy obey their Patriarch and Prince in forbearing to Preach. If all the Bishops of *England* should agree to reduce the Kingdom to one only Bishoprick, and one Church, and turn all the rest into Parish-Chappels, it were a duty to disobey them, and gather Churches in that one Church. If the Patriarch of *Alexandria, Antioch, or Constantinople*, had forbidden all in their limits to Preach and worship God publicly, it had been a wickedness to obey them. When *Severus Antioch*, the *Eutychian*, forbid the Orthodox to Preach in his Patriarchate, it had been their sin to obey him, (yea or if *Theodosius* or *Anastasius* the Emperours had done it): yea, though a General Council of *Ephes.* 2. (if not *Ephes.* 1.) was on his side. If the Pope (whether as Pope or as Patriarch of the West), Interdict all the Preachers and Churches in *Kenice*, or in *Britain*, it were a sin to obey him.

The reasons are, because their power is derived and limited (to pass by the *no power* of Usurpers) the greatest have it for edification, and not for destruction. None of them have power to make void the least (continued) Law of God by their Doctrines, Precepts or Traditions. All men must take heed of the leaven of their false Doctrine, and must beware of false Prophets, and must prove all things, and hold fast that which is good. There is no true power but of God, and therefore none against him. It is better to obey God than men. But of this you may in season have larger proof, if you desire it.

VI. Your excluding us from Salvation, that will not cease Preaching the Gospel of Salvation, and worshipping God, remembreth us:

1. What a mercy it is that neither Pope, nor any such condemnor is made our final Judge.

2. How most Sects agree (*Papists, Quakers, &c.*) in damning those that dance not after their Pipe.

3. What

3. What various wiles of temptations Satan useth to hinder Christs Gospel, and mens Salvation.

At once I have, 1. A backward flesh, that is the worst of all, that faith, *Favour thy self, and expose not thy self to all this labour, obloquie, hatred, suffering, loss and danger of death for nothing, but that work which thy Superiours think needles, and forbid.*

2. I feel Satan, letting in with the flesh, and saying the same.

3. Carnal and worldly friends say the same (as *Peter* to Christ, *Mat. 16.*)

4. Displeased Sinners and Sectaries with me silent.

5. What Superiours say and do, I need not mention.

6. And to perfect all, some Preachers in Prefs and Pulpit, and you in Discourse, declare us in danger of damnation, as Schismatics, unless we will give over Preaching the Gospel. O how easie were it to me to avoid that damnation! And if I incur it, how dearly do I purchase it! It is a sad case that such poor souls as we are in, that would fain know Gods will whatever study or suffering it cost us, and after our most earnest search and prayers, believe that if we forsook our trust, and office, and the peoples souls, we should be judged as sacrilegious, perfidious hypocrites, and yet we are told by *wiser* and *greater* men, that our labours and sufferings do but damn us; may not a man be damned at a cheaper rate than Forty pound a Sermon, or the loss of all his worldly Estate, and lying with malefactors, and perhaps dying in a Goal, under the published sacred infamy of being Schismatics and enemies of the publick Government and peace, &c? But this also we must be fortified against. For Satan is sometime utterly impudent, and will say, *Damn your selves by perfidiusness, and let the people be damned quietly, or else you shall be damned for Schismatics.* But the long noise of *dammning Papists and Quakers* have somewhat hardned or emboldened us. It was an early trick, *Act. 15. Except ye be circumcised and keep the Law of Moses, ye cannot be saved.* When lands and livings will not prevail; when profit, pleasure and honour fail; when poverty, reproach and prisons will not serve, then comes, *You cannot else be saved.* How many Sects say, *Say as we say, and do as we do, and follow us, or you cannot be saved?* But saith St. Paul, *It is a small thing with me to be judged of man, or at mans day: I have one that judgeth me, even the Lord,* (to whom we will appeal whatever you say against it.) But you must give me leave to think, that to draw men from their great duty, and the saving souls, to heinous sin,

fin, as in the name of Christ, and to frighten men into Hell with the fear of damnation, and the abused Word of God, hath heinous aggravations, which enticing men by sensuality to drunkenness, whoredom or theft, hath not.

VII. To the next, the matter of fact, and antecedent Suppositions cannot be denied, *viz.* 1. That it is probably supposed that there are inhabitants more than can hear the Preachers voice in the Parish Churches, in *Martins* Parish about 40000, in *Stepney* Parish near as many, in *Giles Cripplegate* 30000, in *Giles* in the *Fields* near 20000, in *Sepulchres*, *Algate*, *White-chappel*, *Andrews Helborn*, and many other Out-Parishes very many thousands. The last Bill of Mortality that I saw, saith there died in *Stepney* Parish as many wanting one, as in all the Ninety-seven Parishes of *London*, and in *Martins* as many within six, and in *Giles Cripplegate* as many within eight, or thereabout.

2. *How shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe if they hear not? and how shall they hear without a Preacher? If the Gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost: Where Vision faileth, the people perish, even for lack of knowledg.*

3. Yet people by our Church Laws must be presented and prosecuted as Recusants if they come not to Church, and so 40000 or 30000 should be presented and punished for want of room; but it is a greater punishment to be strangers unto the Gospel.

4. The Canon forbiddeth them going to, and communicating in other Parishes, and forbiddeth the Ministers to receive them.

5. The Children of Christians are born with no more knowledg than the children of Heathens; and need teaching as well as theirs, to bring them to knowledg when they grow up.

6. God will not save any adult person that is an Infidel, impenitent, unsanctified, because he is bred up among Christians, and Churches, or born of Christians, and Baptized; but it will go worse with such unholy persons in the day of Judgment, that have had the greatest means.

7. If you can cast the fault on the people, and say that they might remove their dwellings, or (break the Law, and) go to other Parishes, or read at home, &c. that excuseth us not. For the worse they are, the more need they have of help. If they were faultless, what need had they of us?

8. As

8. As to my own case whom you condemn, I have told you, that I have the Ordination of a Bishop, and the License of the Bishop of this Diocese (not hulled or recalled) which by your principles one would think might serve if it had been against Gods own Laws. And yet Gods Law and the Bishops License will not serve.

9. Some other may say, *What's your case to many others?* I answer: To pass by a great deal not now to be said, Let it be understood that the case is this. Men are first silenced and excommunicated, and so forbidden the publick Churches, and all publick worship of God; and then the Excommunicate are persecuted and accused for not coming to Church. Divers Canons do *ipso facto* (that is, *sine senentia*) excommunicate all that do but say that any thing in the Liturgy or Discipline is unlawful, or may not be done with a good conscience (which all *Nonconformists* hold). And it is not possible for us to repent of that as a wicked Error, which after all means that we can possibly use, appeareth unto us an undoubted truth, that so our Excommunication may be taken off. Now these silenced men are assured, that God disobligeth them not from the duty of Preaching; and these excommunicate men are assured that God doth not disoblige them from the duty of publick worship and Church-communication. Therefore they must use it as they can, when they may not use it as they would. Men say the Papists should not call us Schismatics, because they cast us out, and went from us; and will you silence and excommunicate men, as they undertake to prove, for obeying God, and then call them Schismatics for not communicating with you, or for worshipping God in such Church-communication as they can? Indeed many of us communicate with you, because we think not our selves bound, tho' you excommunicate us *ipso facto*, to do execution on our selves, or to go further from you than necessity compelleth us (tho' I must profess that Cyprians 68. Epistle, p. 200. and St. Martin's Separation from the Bishops, confirmed by Miracle, sometimes sticks in my stomach). But I cannot make so light as you do, 1. Of such Texts as 2 Tim. 4. 1, 2. *I charge thee before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judg the quick and the dead at his appearing, and his kingdom, preach the word, be instant in season, out of season, reprove, rebuke, exhort, with all long-suffering and doctrine.*

2. Nor of the murderous famishing of thousands of souls, when to murder one child by famine deserveth death and hell.

3. Nor of Christs Law of preferring *Mercy* before *Sacrifice*, necessary Morals before Rituals, Circumstantial or Ordinals, which are all but *propter rem ordinatam*. I remember you have told me, That if the Bishop forbid all Gods publick worship in the Assemblies, we must forbear. Such sayings, and this, That I must let so many souls be untaught though they be damned, because it is the Bishops fault and not mine, do make me ready to tremble to think of them. If Christs works be saving, whose work is it to make so light of mans damnation? Is it any wonder, if such Principles be called Antichristian? I cannot but perceive from whom they come, when the damnation of poor people must be so easily submitted to, if the Bishop do but command the means. Methinks you wrong the Bishops by such odious Suppositions and Assertions, as if you would make men believe that they are the *Grievous Wolves that spare not the flock*, and the *thorns and thistles that are made to prick and rend the people*. But I believe that the Bishops faultiness in mens damnation would be no excuse to me if I be accessory.

4. And I doubt not but if you unjustly *ipso facto* Excommunicate men, it neither depriveth them of the right, nor absolveth them from the duty of publick Worship, and Church-Communion. And I am ashamed to read and hear Preachers publicly reproaching them for not holding constant Communion with the Parish-Churches, when it's notorious that the Canon hath thus Excommunicated them, yea though it were their duty sometime to intrude.

And I beseech you judg as a Christian or a man, whether you can think such Arguments should draw the people themselves to be of your mind: Go to them and speak out, Neighbours, I confess that while you live in ignorance and sin for want of teaching and publick worship, you are in the way to damnation; but it is the Bishop, and not the silenced Preacher that shall answer for it. Will they not reply, *And shall not the Bishop then be damned instead of us, as well as instead of the silenced Preacher?*

VIII. Your

VIII. Your doubt about *mens power to change Christs settled form of Church-government*, is but a consequent of your first, of *mens absolute power*.

But 1. if they change Gods Laws, or instituted Church-forms or Government, may they not change *their own*? And if so, there is some hope of a Reformation. But why then did the Canons of 1640. in the *Et cætera* Oath, swear the Clergy *never to consent to change*? And why are we now to swear in the Oxford Oath, That we will *never endeavour any alteration of Church-Government* (tho' the keys be in the power of Lay-Chancellors, and tho' the King may command us to endeavour it) must the Nation or Clergy swear never (in their own places) to endeavour any alteration of *the Bishops Institutions* (as you take them), and yet may the Bishops alter the very *Form of Government*, and *Churches* made by our Universal King?

2. What an uncertain mutable thing may Christs Laws or Church-Government prove, while mutable men may change it at their pleasure.

3. To what purpose is *Antiquity* and *Tradition* so much pleaded by Hierarchical Divines, as if that were the Test to know the right Government and Church, if the Bishops may alter it?

4. If thus much of Christs Laws and Institutions may be altered by Prelates, how shall we be sure that all the rest is not also at their will and mercy? or which is it that they may alter, and which not?

5. Doth not this set man so far above God, or equal with him, as will still tempt men to think that more are *Anti-christian* than the Pope? If you say that it is by Gods own grant; I wait for your proof, that God granteth power to any man above his Laws: Those that he made but *Local* or *Temporary* himself, are not abrogated or changed by man where they bind not; for they never bound any but their proper subjects; e. g. The *Jewish* Laws, as such, never bound the Gentile world; and the command of washing feet, bound only those where the use of going bare-leg'd with Sandals in a hot Country,

try, made it an office of kindness ; and so of other Temporary precepts.

6. How contrary is this to the common Christian Doctrine, that we must obey none that command us to sin against God? For by the first assertion, and this, it seemeth that it cannot be a sin which the Bishops command.

7. I pray you put in an exception for the Power and Lives of Kings, and the Laws of the Land, and the Property and Liberty of the Subjects ; and one word for the Protestant Religion. For we *English*-men think God to be greater than the King, or *St. Patrick* ; and Gods Laws to be firmer than the Statutes of King and Parliament. And yet I doubt that the King and some Parliament will be angry if you do but say that the Bishops by consent may change their *Statutes*, or lawful Officers and Powers ; And Bishops, if you say that *Episcopacy* may be changed.

IX. Baptism, as such, entereth not the Baptized into any particular Church, but only into the *Universal*, headed by Christ ; yet a man may at the same time be entered into the *Universal*, and into a *particular Church*, but that is by a double consent, and not by Baptism as such. In this I know none that agree with you but some few of the *Independents* in *New-England*, and some of the *Papists*. I confess *Beharmin* saith, That by Baptism we are virtually obliged to the Pope, being baptized by a Ministry, and into a Church, of which he is the Head. But the contrary is proved,

1. From the express form of the Baptismal Covenant, which only tyeth us to Christ and his Universal Church, and maketh us Christians. But to be a Christian dedicated to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, is one thing, and to be a part of the Pastoral Charge of *A. B.* or *N. N.* is another thing.

2. What particular Church was the Eunuch, *Act. 8.* baptized into? Not that of *Jerusalem*, for he was going from it, never like to see it more. Not that in *Ethiopia*, for there was none till he began it. If you say, of *Philips Church* : 1. I pray you, where was that ? 2. And how prove you it ? 3. Specially if

if it was *Philip* the Deacon that had no Church, being no Bishop.

3. May not men be baptized in *Turkey*, or among other Infidels, or *Indians*, where there is no Church? And is the first baptized man among them, a Church himself? *Paul* thanketh God that he baptized no more of the *Corinthians*, lest they should think that he baptized into his own name. And doth every Baptizer baptize to himself, or to his Bishop? A man may baptize out of all Diocesses, or in another's.

X. As to your next Assertion, I grant, that when a Bishop or a beggar speaketh the Commands of God, and a King speaketh against it, we must follow that Bishop or beggar, rather than the King, because this is but obeying God before men. But supposing that it is a thing *indifferent*, and but *circa sacra*, and not a *proper part* of the *Agent Pastors Office*, I confess to you, I will obey the King before the Bishop.

1. Because it is a thing that is under the Power of the King to command; and if so, the King is the Supreme, and not the Bishop.

2. Bishops themselves are Subjects of the King, and owe him obedience. Therefore rule not over or before him in matters belonging to his Office.

3. Bishops are chosen by the King, (for I suppose no man takes the Dean and Chapters choice for more than a Ceremony, that knoweth it); if the King command me to Preach at one hour, or one place, and the Bishop at another, or to use for Uniformity such a Translation, Metre, Liturgy, Utensils, Garments, &c. and the Bishops others, I will obey the King before the Bishop. But if either or both command me to *sin*, I will obey neither so; and if they would take me off from that which Christ hath made a real part of my *own Office* (as commanding that I shall preach and pray in *no words* but such as they *prescribe*, &c.) I think neither hath power to do this.

But Bishop *Bilson* of *Christian Obedience*, and Bishop *Andrews* in his *Tortura Toctis*, and *Buckeridge* of *Rocheſter*, and *Grotius de imprio ſum. Poſeſt. circa Sacra*, have ſaid ſo much of the Power

of Kings about Religion, as that I think I need not add any more.

And by the same Arguments that you will absolve me from obeying if *the King forbid me to Preach*; by the same you absolve, if the Bishop forbid me. If I may disobey *Constantinus* and *Valens*, I may disobey *Eusebius Nicomed.* *Theognis Maris*. If I may disobey *Theodosius junior*, *Anastasius*, *Zeno*, *Justinian*, I may disobey *Petrus Moggus*, *Dioscorus*, *Severus*, &c. But you will much cross your ends if you tell the *Londoners* that they may preach and worship God though the King forbid them, but not at all if the Bishop forbid them. For he that exalteth himself, or is falsely exalted by others, shall be brought low. If the reverence of the King were not greater in *England* than of the Bishops, the consciences of many thousands would stick but little at disobedience. There are so many cases first to be resolved. As,

1. Whether such Diocesans deposing all Parochial Churches (and Bishops) and reducing them to Chappels or parts only of a Church, be not against Christs Law?

2. Whether they destroy not the ancient order of *particular Churches* (Bishops) and Discipline?

3. Who made their office, and by what power?

4. Who chose and called them to it?

5. Whether their Commands be not null, as contrary to Gods?

6. How far Communion with them that silence hundreds of faithful Ministers, and set up in their stead——&c. is lawful? Many such questions the people are not so easily satisfied in, as you are.

XI. And the three last all set together, look with an ill design: The Preface to *Dr. Rich. Cousins* Tables, tells the King, That the Church-Government here is the *Kings*, or *derived from him*, and *dependant on him*; and *Grotius de Imperio sum. potest.* proveth at large the Power of Kings *circa sacra*, as doth *Spalatensis*, and many more; and that Canons are but good counsel, till the King make them Laws. And we know no Law-makers but the King and Parliament. But if the Church be the Expounders of the Liturgy, Rubrick and Canons, Articles and Acts of Uniformity, and out

of

of Convocation-time, the Bishops be the Church, and the Archbishops be the Rulers of the Bishops, (that swear obedience to them) this hath a dangerous aspect. For then it is in the power of the Bishops (if not of the Archbishops only) to put a sense upon our 39 Articles, Rubricks, &c. consistent with Popery or Heresie, and so to change the Religion of the Kingdom, without King or Parliament, or against them at their pleasure.

And thus Officers of mans making, who become a Church of mans devising, may have advantage by this and the former Articles, to destroy Godliness, Christianity and Humanity.

Indeed by the Preface to the Liturgy, the Bishop is made the Expounder of any thing doubtful in the Book; and by the *Index* the Act of Uniformity is made part of the Book. But this affrighteth me the more from declaring:

1. Because I must consent to all the Penalties and Impositions of the Act it self.

2. And the Bishops Exposition is limited, so that it must be contrary to nothing in the Book.

Thus I have given you the reasons of my *destructive Conference*.

If I had been with you, and we had been to enter upon any dispute that tendeth to satisfaction, I would have endeavoured to avoid the common frustraters of Disputes, 1. By ambiguous words: 2. And subjects that are no subjects: Therefore if you desire any such dispute:

I. I intreat you to write me down your sense of some terms which we shall frequently use, (and I will do the like of any at your desire): As what you mean, 1. By the word *Bishop*. 2. By a *Church*. 3. By a *particular Church*. 4. By a *Diocess and Diocesan Church*. 5. By a *National Church*. 6. By the *Universal Church*. 7. By *Church Government and Jurisdiction*. 8. By *Schism*. I shall dispute no terms unexplained, lest one take them in one sense, and the other in another, and so we dispute but about a found of words.

II. I desire that the *denied Subject* of the Question may not be taken for granted, instead of being proved.

On these terms (supposing the common Laws of Disputation, especially avoiding words that have no determinate sense) I shall not

not refuse whenever you invite me ; and I am able to debate with you any of these points that I am concerned in ; especially, *whether my Preaching Christs Gospel as I do, be my sin, or my duty ?* And if our great distance in Principles put either of us upon reasons that seem dishonouring to the person opposed, we shall I hope remember that it is the *opinion* only that is directly intended. But, that the said opinion is the *persons opinion*, if it be bad, is a dishonour, which the *owner only* is guilty of, and the opponent cannot help ; who must not forbear to open the evil of the cause, for avoiding the dishonour of the owner ; but must the *rather* open it, in hope that the owner will disown it, when he understandeth truly what it is. For I suppose it is evidence of Truth that we desire.

In Conclusion, remember I pray you, 1. That it is not the ancient Episcopacy (which was in *Cyprians* days ; yea, which agreeth with *Epiphanius's* Intimations, and *Petavius* excellent Notes thereon, in *Heres. 69.*) which I deny. And I conjecture that at this day in *England* there are more *Episcopal* than *Presbyterian* silenced *Nonconformists*.

2. That what sort of Prelacy or higher Rulers I dare not subscribe to, yet I can live quietly and submissively under, though not obey them by sinning against God, or breaking my Vows of Baptism or Ordination, and perfidiously leaving souls to Satan. Nothing more threateneth the subversion of the Church-Government than swearing men to approve of all that's in it. Many can submit and live in peace, that dare not subscribe or swear Approbation. It was the *cetera* Oath 1640, that constrained me to those searches which made me a *Nonconformist*. It is an easie matter for Overdoers to add but a clause or two more to their Oaths and Subscriptions, which shall make almost all the conscionable Ministers of the Kingdom *Nonconformists*.

3. Whenever notorious necessity ceaseth by the sufficient number and quality of Conforming Preachers, I will cease Preaching in *England*. (But death is liker first to silence me.)

Though I take my Conforming to be a Complex of heinous sins, should

should I be guilty of it; yet till I am called, I persuade none to Nonconformity for fear of casting them (occasionally) out of the Ministry, preferring their work before the change of their judgment till such endeavours are clearly made by duty.) But all your endeavour, as far as ever I perceived, is not so much to draw us to Conformity, as to persuade us to give over Preaching Christs Gospel, so contrary are our designs. 1 *Thes* 2. 15, 16. Methinks is a fearful Text. And so are the words of the Liturgy before the Sacrament, *If any of you be a hinderer of Gods Word—repent—or take not this Sacrament, lest Satan enter into you, as he did into Judas, and fill you, &c.* 2219 149

F I N I S

3 1 1 1 1

A N
ACCOUNT
OF MY
DISSENT
FROM
Dr. Sherlocke,

H I S
Doctrine, Accusations, & Argumentation.

ESPECIALLY

About the Essence of the Universal, National and single Church, and the nature of Schism, and the terms of Christian Concord. As also of my Dissent from the *French*, from Bishop *Gunning*, and his Chaplain Dr. *Saywell*, Mr. *Thorndike*, Bishop *Bramhall*, Bishop *Sparrow*, Mr. *Dodwell*, &c. on the same Subject.

By RICH. BAXTER, not as their Accuser, but a Defender of himself and the Protestants against other mens Accusations, who call for the Execution of the Laws against Us.

L O N D O N,

Printed for *Tho. Parkhurst*, at the Bible and Three Crowns in *Cheapside*, near *Mercers-Chappel*. 1681.

An Account of my Dissent from Dr. Sherlocke, his *Doctrine, Accusations* and *Argumentation, &c.*

CHAP. I.

The Historical Proem.

SECT. 1.

WHEN Mr. *Dodwell* had published his old Letters to me, with his Reply to my Confutation of his Schismatical Book (which nullifieth not only the Churches Ministry, Sacraments, and Covenant-right to Salvation, of the Reformed Transmarine Christians, but, as I think I have proved, of all, or almost all the Christian World), I thought it needful, as an Antidote to prevent the death of Christian charity, to publish also the Letters which I had sent to him, (the last of which came not to his hands, because he was gone into the Country), and with them my Consideration of his Reply. But weariness of dealing with this sort of men, made me cast it by about a quarter of a year, and then Dr. *Stillingfleet's* Defender, by insulting and joining in the deceit, persuaded me to let it go forth. His words are *Pag. 437. All these pretences have been so shamefully baffled by Mr. Dodwell in his Letters to Mr. B. that no man need concern himself further in that cause.* The shame of the baffle I shall bear with thankfulness, if it be truth that shames and baffles me. My soul would rejoice by such a discovery to make a publick recantation. But if that which must shame me, be their dangerous deceit, notoriously tending to the extirpation of Church-

Discipline, and to the destruction of Christian Love and Concord, and to engage their Church in the Persecuting and destroying of the faithful Servants of Christ, I must expect to bear more from such men than baffling and shame.

§ 2. The first Question which we are concerned in with this sort of men, is, *Whether Nonconformists deserve to be forbidden to Preach the Gospel, and to be Excommunicated ipso facto, and to be fined 20 l. and 40 l. a Sermon, and laid in the Common Gaol with Rogues, from six months to six months, till they die?*

The second Question is, *Whether their not Conforming to all the Covenants Oaths, Declarations, Subscription and Practices imposed on them, be a crime deserving this, (with their not ceasing to Preach the Gospel)?*

The third Question is, *Whether it would not be sin (yea heinous sin) in them so to Conform and cease Preaching?*

§ 3. These be the cases that we have to dispute. We still disclaim accusing others. We only think we are bound (not resisting any of their force) to deny false Accusations, and give a reason of what we do, and why we suffer, rather than against our Consciences obey them. And this we forbore more than seven and seven years, lest we should exasperate them, while they continued to persuade the world (yea our Superiors) that we took not the matters of Conformity for any sin, but for inconveniences. They spoke this, they preached it, they wrote it. We wondered, thinking formerly that there were no men called Protestant Divines that would do this in the open light of the Sun, against the visible evidence of our Writings, and against our open Disputations with them, Petitions to them, our Protestations; our practices and our sufferings; but we could not deny their *fact*, though they denied ours. We now saw there were such men, and with whom we had to do; we gave over wondering at such as *Tympius, Bolsek, &c.* They continued to make our Rulers believe that we kept up a dangerous Schism in the Church, against that which we took to be no sin, merely to make good what we had said and done, and to avoid repenting. They called out in Press and Pulpit for the Execution of the Laws against us, as if our suffering were yet too light. Our Rulers askt us, *What we stuck at, and what we would have?* And when yet we durst not tell them, they published us *obstinate* in adhering to a *baffled cause*, when

we

we had nothing to say for it. And at last told us how ill our Superiors thought of us for it, and threatened to petition them to compel us to give in our Reasons of Nonconformity. Would not an indifferent person think all this was a sufficient call and warrant for us to speak? But we knew they that called for it could not bear it.

§. 4. I drew up first a Catalogue of the matters, and summary reasons of our Nonconformity; but on perusal I saw they would take it for an accusation of them, and could not bear it. I then drew up all our case by way of Query, to engage their own consideration. But when it was done, I saw it made their cause so naked, that they could not bear it. I wrote a full Treatise of *Episcopacy* as the reason of our not swearing or subscribing to them, and our not becoming the Purgators of all the thousands that had sworn it, for not endeavouring (by lawful means in their places and callings) any alteration of the Government of the Church. I thought this alone was reason enough why we should rather die than conform. But I cast all these by, as perceiving that mens impatience would turn it by exasperation, to the increase of their wrath, and of our reproach and suffering; where Satan hath once got *strong worldly interest* on his side, he hath with multitudes (even of men called Reverend and Learned) done half his work, and virtually armed them against the clearest evidence of truth, and erected a Fort which neither plain Scripture or reason, or the common experience of the world, can batter, till God will do it. But this last Treatise (of *Episcopacy*) Mr. *Dodwell* hath since drawn out.

§ 5. When my Conscience would endure my silence no longer, against the will of my advisers, I confess, I ventured nakedly to tell those that so earnestly called for it, what it is that we durst not do? Intending if they bore with that, to give them our Reasons or Arguments after. But the thing that I feared was the consequent; they thought while we named so many hainous crimes which we feared and avoided, that it intimated that they were guilty of them, and so we made them *Perjured, Perfidious, Persecuting Villains*; and the tempest of their wrath did presently assault us with multiplied accusations. And when in any writing we tell them of their Errors, in false Accusations, or false Doctrine, or false History; they tell us that we *rail and revile them*; and to manifest any of their untruths, or abuses, or fallacies in arguing, is an intollerable crime; nothing but passion,

passion, rage, fury, if not rebellion or sedition, (by such an inference as [*No Bishop, no King*] or a much worse. Thus we are fallen into mens hands that will neither endure us to be silent, nor after 16 or 17 years silence and provocation to speak, and profess as Dr. *Stillingsfleet*, that *they gave us not the least provocation*. I have said all this before; but there is no understanding any Controversie without remembering the matter of fact, and the state of the question.

§. 6. I doubted whether I should name this accusing-defender, because he doth not name himself. But uncontroled fame saying it is Dr. *Sherlock*, and it being useful to know with whom we have to do, I name him only as famed to be the Author, which if he deny, I will not affirm.

§. 7. As to his Book, it loudly tells the world, That such Conformists, and the Nonconformists, are agreed, that the Devils great design against Christianity and mens Salvation, is to turn Christs own Offices and Ordinances, Ministry and Preaching, against himself, and to do his destructive work in the name of Christ, and as by his authority. And that it is the Clergy that are become the great dividers and danger of the Church, and the grand hinderers of Christian love, peace and concord, and consequently the danger of Kings and Kingdoms. If one side think so of them, this Book of his, and many such another, tell us, that they think so of others. That the Clergy are the great danger of the Land and Church, we are agreed. All the question is, Who of them it is, whether this party, or that, or both?

§. 8. One side saith it is the Puritans, the other that it is the *Parliamentarians*; now they go by the reproaches of *Whiggs* and *Tories*. What *Whiggs* are, I know not, nor whence so called; but I am sure it is the *PR-IG'S Pride* the father, and *Ignorance* the mother by the seed of *worldly carnal interest*, that beget the *malignant contention, division and cruelty that threatens Church and State*. I never yet to my remembrance met with a malignant fierce dividing contender, but he was a man very *IGNORANT* of the matters about which he raised strife; and for an *IGNORANT* man to rage and be confident in error, and think that all deserve to be excommunicate, silenced, laid in Prisons, or ruined, that are not of his mind, or do oppose him, must needs be a hainous overvaluing of

of himself, which is *PRIDE*. And yet if you do but discover their *IGNORANCE*, be it never so gross, or tell them of any of their error or sin, the discovery must prove that it's you that are *Proud*, and they are half justified by the very naming their sin. And the Devil hath got a crafty trick to draw them into sin of so odious a nature, that he shall seem to rail that doth but name it to the guilty. Let a man silence never so many faithful Ministers, or write the most palpable untruths against them, he raileth that would have him repent, or tells him of lying or persecution.

And what but a *worldly carnal interest* could be fruitful seed for such an off-spring? whatever sheeps-clothing they wear, the grievous wolves mentioned, *Act. 20.* are they that make *merchandize of souls*. And whatever plausible confident Volumes they may write, and Pulpit-exclamations they may use, or what paint soever they may put on the worst cause, it is they that *serve not Christ, but their own bellies, who by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple*, *Rom. 16. 16, 17.* Methinks I see the Picture of *St. Paul*, and of *Diotrephes*, or a Pope before me; the latter gnashing his teeth at all that obey him not, and oppose his worldly grandure and dominion, and crying, *Away with him, crucifie him. Away with such a fellow; it is not fit that he should live; away with these precise Schismatics, Hereticks, Phanatics, to the Gaol, to the Stake, or Gallows?* The other saying as *Phil. 3. 18, 19.* *I tell you weeping, they are enemies to the Cross of Christ, whose God is their belly, who glory in their shame, who mind earthly things: But our conversation is in Heaven.*

Yea, methinks I see the different case of the Twelve, before the Spirit came down on them and after, before (*Luk. 22.*) they are striving which should be greatest; and even *Peter*, *Mat. 16.* dissuadeth Christ from suffering, and persuadeth him to favour himself and escape, till Christ say, *Get thee behind me Satan, thou savourest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men:* But after they became the *servants of all*, and seek their honour and reward in humility, and doing good to all, glorying with *Paul* in his infirmities, and becoming all things to all men, and not accounting their lives dear, that they may finish their course with joy.

§. 9. I intreat all Gods Servants that love his Churches peace and safety, to pray earnestly to God to discover to us, who they are that are these *Proud, ignorant, worldly, fleshy men* that are the Churches.

ches plague or danger ; and that if it be I, and such as I, it may not be unknown to us, and we may not live or die impenitent. For though the *Vindicator* in excuse of the *Peccavimus* of the mutable Bishops, by reflection suppose me an enemy to repentance, either he (whom I never saw) knows me much better than I know my self, or else I study, pray and long for a true information and conviction, which may bring me to the most open *peccavi* or confession. I am certain that I am ignorant, yea so ignorant, that I am tempted to doubt of my own apprehensions when from the matter I see no cause of doubting ; but I can truly say, That though in haste I be too neglective of words and circumstantial, I have determined of few substantial causes of any great concern without many years trial, as diligent and impartial as I can use ; forty-three years have I now studied the old Conformity, and nineteen the new ; and I can truly say that I take *Pride* especially of our *Knowledge* or *Goodness*, to be so mad or Diabolical a sin in one that hath so vile and painful a body as I, so dark an understanding, and so bad a heart, that so far as I am proud, I am most unexcusable ; and I am sure it is conjunct with constant *self-vilifying*, and mens contempt doth seem no very unjust or offensive thing to me, when it reflects not on the truth and cause of God.

§. 10. The Author that I am now to answer, is pleased oft to reflect on the *Doctrine* of the *Nonconformists*, as if they Preached against Truth and Peace ; and yet I find not that he proveth it ; nor that they have been these nineteen years accused upon proof before any Judicature of any more ill Doctrine than the chief of their accusers. For my own part, I should think that the publishing of my Doctrine in near Eighty Books (of which three in Folio) might allow me to say, that *in secret have I said nothing : Ask my writings what I hold*. If they say, *It is Heresie*, let them prove it. If they say, *Disloyalty*, let them read my *second Plea for Peace*, and I will take it thankfully to see my error. But if in malice they will rake into that which is twenty years revoked, and yet call for *Retractions*, or talk falsely of matters of *fact*, and *times*, and *things*, and *persons* which they knew not, let them take their course.

§. 11. But supposing that same is true which makes this Accuser of our Doctrine to be Dr. *Sherlocke*, I will first tell the world what transactions about such matters I have had with him, and desire to

be reproved if I have dealt uncharitably or uncivilly, or erroneously with him.

It is not long ago since he came to me at *Acton* (where I lived when silenced and ejected), as seemed to me in the garb of a young man not fixed in his resolutions to conform, (and therefore I thought not yet Ordained), and he told me, *That he came to hear what I had to say against Conformity?* I asked him, *Why he asks me the question?* and *whether he were in any doubt?* and if so, of what? He would give me no answer to any of this. *But he would know what I had to say against Conformity?* I told him I did not use to tell men what I had to say, I knew not why, nor without cogent reason to seek to make others of my mind. I thought him a resolved designing aggressor, and imagined that his honest father had made him consent to come first to hear what I could say, and that he used this way of his own to secure his ends. But foreseeing that he was like to go home and say *Mr. Baxter had nothing to say against Conformity*; I told him why I could not own the *English State of Prelacy* as unavoidably casting out the Discipline of Christ. He told me, *That he was of Dr. Stillingfleet's judgment in his Arminian, that faith, No form of Church-Government is of Divine Institution.* I thought it strange that he that thought so, could yet subscribe to what is said of the three Orders from the *Apostolic time in the Book of Ordination.* But now how far is this man changed? I allow him to be wiser since he writes himself *D. D.* and wish I could have learnt in 43 years as much as he thinks he hath done since then.

§. 12. After this he published a famous Book against the supposed dangerous Doctrines of some about *Imputation of Christ's Righteousness*, and against mens pretending to acquaintance and marriage with Christ, and many such things. A friend of his desired me to write my judgment of it. I told him, I had rather tell it the Author secretly alone. He vouchsafed to come to me. I presumed to tell him how he had made odious some unapt words of a few others, with words so much worse of his own, as seemed to import no less than a denial of our belief in God, the Father, Son and Holy Ghost; but hoping he meant better than he spake, advised him by explication or retraction to prevent the consequences; and the next day wrote to him this Letter following.

CHAP. II.

To the Reverend Mr. Sherlock.

S. I. R.

THE freedom which you offered me, encourageth me thus to tell you more distinctly than I could then do in haste, what objections against your Book I think you will be concerned to give the world satisfaction in.

1. It will be thought in these distracted times of division, to be notoriously factious to widen the breach, and to hinder the reconciliation of minds. And upon my knowledge some on one side are tempted by it to think the hardlier of the Conformists; and persons of honour on the other side that have read it; and understand not the Controversie, think odiously of the *Nonconformists* as fools or Hereticks. Either you would have our divisions healed or not: If not—If yea, then either by reconciliation, or by the extirpation of the *Nonconformists*. If the first, you would quench the fire with oil. If the latter, you are worse than an unskilful Chyrurgeon.

2. You seem to lay a snare, to insinuate that against the *Nonconformists* which you durst not expressly charge them with; and secretly to perswade the Reader, that it is them that you mean throughout. For you plainly oft intimate that it is some party, and more than whole you name, and you make them to be those who have spoken against me (which few of those whom you name have done.) And at the same time cometh out the *Sober Inquiry* into the reasons of the *Nonconformists* esteem, &c. a Book of the same spirit and strain, charging the *Nonconformists* with the same things, as the *Friendly Debate* also hath done. Whereas, for ought I know, ten to one of the *Nonconformists* (if not forty) are of my mind in the point in Controversie; and only a few of the *Independents*, and a very few others, not well studied in the matter, are of their mind whom you oppose. And it's common with the *Presbyterian* and *Episcopal* *Nonconformists* to say, that a few of the old *Independents* by their over-much heat against *Arminianism* under pretence of exalting free grace, and by their unhappy wording of their *Savoy-Article*.

ticle of Justification, have injured the truth and common cause.

3. You seem exceeding partial in your charge, in naming four or five *Nonconformists* as the proper defenders of that Doctrine which the far greatest part of all the Protestant Churches have long held.

4. You seem too bold and harsh an accuser of all these Protestants under the names of four or five men. The world knoweth that the *Lutheran* Churches, even those that in other things say as the *Arminians* do, almost unanimously hold that Doctrine of Imputed Righteousness which you oppose. And that almost all the *Calvinists* went the same way till the Controversie about the active and passive righteousness managed by *Olevian*, *Urfin*, *Piscator*, *Pareus*, and the rest, put a stop to it. And that the most learned Prelates and Conformists of *England* (and most that write against the *Papists*) seem to go the same way. And that almost all our Voluminous Controversies against them, written by the foreign Divines, till lately, run in the same channel. And that when Mr. *Wotton* let the matter straiter in *London*, most were against him; and when Mr. *Bradshaw* wrote his Tractate for Reconciliation, and Mr. *Gataker* in many writings defended the sounder way, even among the Conformists, the most dissented. And when *John Goodwin* rose up for the same cause, the greater part seemed to be against him. And when about twenty-five years ago I declared my self for that middle way in the point, which *Bradshaw* and *Grotius de Satisfaction* had opened, many Conformists as well as others were against me; why did you not then plainly tell your Reader, that it is of old and of late almost all the Protestants that you accuse with so much severity?

5. You seem to injure the present Protestants by rendring them to the *Papists* (who join with you in this charge) more erroneous and more divided than they are. For we all offer to subscribe the same Articles of Religion; and therefore his Majesty in his Declaration about Ecclesiastical affairs, proclaimeth his displeasure against Doctor *Burgess* his Book (for that was it meant) for pretending that we differ in Doctrine. And now you would make the world believe that we are so different therein, as to be in a manner of two Religions.

6. You manage not the real Controversie in any such method, as Controversies are managed by all learned men, or as may profit and satisfie the Reader that would know the truth. You should

have stated the Questions accurately, which you would dispute, and have well opened the terms, and have given us your Arguments clearly, and answered theirs; whereas he that readeth your Book from end to end, will not easily find what is the true Controversie, much less orderly and accurately stated. And the Arguments of the Dissenters are mostly passed by, and Arguments of your own are hardly to be perceived. But instead of all this, mens words which sound not well, are recited, and they will say that a supercilious continued stile of scorn, doth pass for argument or confutation. Indeed all that you had to do was to have opened in what sense Christs Righteousness is or is not imputed to us. And the sum of all the Controversie is but this, Whether Christ fulfilled the Law and suffered, (not only thereby to merit all that Pardon, Justification, Adoption, Spirit and Glory, which is given by the new Covenant as you and I hold; but also) in the person of each elected sinner, *in sensu legali*, (though not in his natural person) so that we are justified by the Law of innocency, and its works, which saith, *obey perfectly; and live*, as having fulfilled it all in and by Christ? This you and I deny. And how much otherwise doth Wotton *de reconcil. Bradshaw, Gataker, John Goodman*, dispute this, than you do as to the mode? To come out after such Learned Disputations, and think that the contemptuous reciting of four mens words should do the business, will not convince Dissenters.

7. They will call it livor or malignity, that you fall upon that which is blameless with the rest; what error or harm is in Mr. Vincents words, when St. Paul hath much the like, *I have espoused you to one husband*; and the Prophet, *Thy maker is thy husband*? How did Mr. Watson offend by allegorizing? Do you not know that (besides the Canticles, and many other Scriptures) abundance of the ancient fathers do the like, and who reproacheth them for it? Almost all of them, I think, fall under this censure. And there are many of Dr. Omens words blameless which you blame, to say nothing of the rest.

18. They will say it is profane to make the very words of Scripture used by them, part of your reproachful recitation? and many of them not by them interpreted in any ill sense. But if they were, the sense only should have been blamed. And your talk of *marrying Christ by the Liturgy and the Ring*, will seem no better; and against the Apostle as well as them. And you distinguish not between the Allegorizers Explication and Applications. Do you think they use

not to open the nature of faith in proper terms, as well as you? But in Applicatory amplifications for the affections, what Fathers, what Papists, what Protestants do not allegorize? what false Doctrine can you prove that ever Mr. Vincent taught? &c. —

9. You must answer them that will say that you Subscribe one year, and write against the Doctrine of the Church which you subscribe to, another? while those that you oppose are thought worthy of silencing for not Subscribing. For they think the 1st, 12th, and 13th Articles of the Church are opposed by you, and the Doctrine of the Homilies, (and of the Apology of the Church.)

10. The worst of all is, that really it is injurious to the Readers that most applaud your Books, while it killeth their love, and teacheth them unjustly to condemn and hate their Brethren, if not to further their afflictions; it seeming to Preach Christ in envy and strife to add affliction to the afflicted; that they that come lately out of the Common Goals among Rogues might be thought meet for such places than for the Church or Pulpit.

And they will say, that while you accuse others of dangerous Doctrines, your Doctrine is so unsound on the other extrem, as to be downright Heresie, and to subvert all Christianity and Religion in the three Essential Articles of which I spake to you.

In denying God as our God, while you say, *That the love we owe to God and Christ, is no other than Gratitude, because God loved us first. And, Could we be supposed to love God — purely for himself — it would not be accepted, because this is not a reasonable love, but an unaccountable and foolish passion.* Dreadful! it is such as the love of Christs Glorified humanity to his Father, if not of Angels and all perfect Spirits, or certainly the highest and perfectest part of it; and is that an unreasonable and foolish passion!

So P. 414. *A goodness which is considered as doing no good, is so far from being the object of our love, that it is not the object of our understanding.* But doubtless, though none denieth but we must love God as our Benefactor; yet of him, and by him, and to him are all things; and it is essential to God, relatively considered as our God, to be the *Causa prima efficiens, causa suprema regens, & causa finalis ultimata ultimata.* And for our selves to be Alpha or Omega, our own first or last cause, is to be Gods or Idols to our selves. God made all things for himself; and for his pleasure or will (as by his will) they are and were created. God is intelligible as before all his benefits or works; and he that knoweth him not as good in himself,

ante.

antecedently to all Communicated goodness, or at least (if he think the World eternal) distinct from it, yea as infinitely essentially good beyond all created goodness, and his relation thereto, knoweth no God. And he that knoweth not that *Goodness* as *Goodness* is *Amiability*, though it were not either *our felicity*, or a *means* thereto, hath lost the knowledge of humanity. An Angel, or the wisest and holiest man in the world were amiable, though he were in solitude, and never did good to me or any one. Should God place one Angel in the state of perfectest love to himself, and not useful to any fellow-creature, that Angel were amiable. That man that *loveth God only* for doing him good, (or other men) loveth him as a dog loveth his master for feeding him, and as the master loveth his dog for serving him; that is, he loveth himself best, and God but for himself, (or others), for the End, as such, is ever loved better than the Means as such. Thus God is feigned to be finally for the Creature, and not the Creature for God. Or to be the *finis cuius*, and man the *finis cui*. Dr. Stern the Physician of *Dublin*, hath such a whimsey in his *Medela anime*, that man is Gods end, and not God mans end, or his own; but it is by ignorance of the *ratio finis*, and a false conceit, that because God needeth us not, he cannot be our End; when his will as efficient is the beginning, and his will as fulfilled and terminative is the end of all the Creatures. He that maketh himself his *finis ultimat ultimus*, and God the means, changeth places with God in his imagination. Twenty Schoolmen on the Questions *de Amore Dei & de Beatitudine*, will tell you how unanimously *Papists* concur with Protestants in this: yea, when all the difficulty is whether, *Amor concupiscentia quo Deum ut nobismet ipsis bonum amamus*, be any part of our *finis ultimus*, though not the chief part; most say that it is not so much as any part, but a subordinate act; of which among others see at large *Aegidius de Presentatione de Anima Beatitudine*. And almost all say that it is but an inferior part of the *finis ultimus*, and no part of the *finis ultimat ultimus*; that is, it is conjunct with our most perfective act, but is not it itself: I feel in my self, 1. That it is my sensitive and natural powers which have a necessary inclination to self preservation for the ends of this life. 2. And that it is my sinful state that hath subjected my reason to this love of self and life, and made it inordinate. 3. But that so far as reason is reason, as I am wholly Gods propriety, I am not valuable but for him, and that his will (which is his interest) is the Rule of all created Goodness; and that if I had not rather be annihilated than the World,

or

or this Kingdom, or thousands should be so (yea or any more excellent than my self), or if I would not die to save my King or County, it would be but the prevalency of sense and nature against Reason. And that God is more amiable than King or Country, or the world.

2. I said so much to you of the second Article, that I will say but this: The knowledg of Christs Person (which is called by them *Our acquaintance with him*), is life eternal in part; and most Heresies condemn'd by your Councils have been errors about Christs Person. And undoubtedly as we must take a man for our Physician, by consent, before we can take his Medicines; and for our King before we can obey him, and our Tutor before we learn of him, &c. so Christianity and Baptism it self, is a taking Christ for our Lord and Saviour; and to deny this, is to Unchristen us. Which as you do not, so you should not seem to do. Nor had you need to strain and pervert many Texts as you have done, by saying that by Christ is meant the Gospel, when the Gospel in many is but connoted, as Christs work.

3. And *Pag.* 389. to say that the Testimony of the Spirit concerns the general adoption of Christians for the Sons of God, not to testifie to any particular man that he is a good Christian, or in a state of Grace; seemeth a denial of the third Article of our Baptism; and of the plain Scripture, and of all mens comfort in this world. As my reason beareth witness that I am a man, 1. *Constitutive, Objective, per modum evidentie.* 2. *Et active seipsam discernendo, & argumentative probando*, so doth the Spirit testifie the Sanctification of the Sanctified. If a man cannot know that he is a sincere Christian, he can have no knowledg that any promise to such belongeth to him any more than to an Infidel or wicked man. If he know it, how shall it be but by the indwelling operating Spirit of Christ? that is, in Scripture sense, by the love of God, or by inherent holiness wrought by the Spirit, the Divine Nature, the Image of God, which is the Spirit as a witness, earnest, first fruits and pledge, and seal of God. *If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, the same is none of his, Rom. 8. 4. If by the Spirit ye mortifie the deeds of the flesh ye shall live; Ver. 13. There is no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus, that walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit, Ver. 1. Because ye are Sons he hath sent the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, by which ye cry Abba Father, Gal. 4. 6. The Spirit beareth witness with our spirits (which are only individuum)*

duorum) that we are the Sons of God, Rom. 8. 16. By this we know that we are the children of God by the Spirit which he hath given us. And to each believer the Spirit is promised to be as a well of living water springing up to everlasting life. And except a man be born of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God, Joh. 3. 5, 6. Except we eat the flesh of Christ, we have no life; and it is the Spirit that quickeneth, the flesh (without it) profiteth nothing. Though we expect not an Enthusiastical testimony of the Spirit, as saying, Thou art a child of God, immediately; yet all Christians must have the foresaid inherent proof or evidencing testimony of the Spirit. Moreover Pag. 369. you misexpound Rom. 7. and upbraid others with the consequences of your misexposition.

What you say, pag. 367. of *splendida peccata*, is no more their Doctrine than *Augustines*, and 12th, and 13th Articles of the Church, which you subscribe: but you stretch it beyond all their meaning.

Pag. 335. l. ult. you assert Christs Righteousness, *quodammodo*, imputed, and yet elsewhere, oft speak against imputation undistinguished.

Pag. 251. you say, that *Abel*, and *Enoch*, those good men, had no other particular revelation of Gods will, but that God is, and is a Rewarder, &c. How prove you that? That they had no revelation to sacrifice, and to expect pardon by the seed of the Woman, &c?

Pag. 247. That Faith is a fiducial reliance, or a trust, is past all doubt: And how know you, that *Abraham*, that saw Christs days, and rejoiced, had no trust in him for salvation?

Pag. 192. You say of the Lords Supper, This is the only Act of Religion, which in Scripture signifieth Communion.

How Prove you that 2 Cor. 13. 14. the Communion of the Holy Ghost. And 6. 14. 1 Joh. 1. 3. Our Communion (I like not the word fellowship) is with the Father. And v. 6. & 1 Cor. 1. 9. Psal. 94. 20. are meant only of the Eucharist? What is our Communion but our access to God as our Father by the Mediator? Our acceptance with, and Communication from him? And have we this never but at the Eucharist? Do you say that you have none your self in Prayer, Praise, Preaching, Hearing, Meditation, &c?

Pag. 162. It's a strange passage, *Though Christ be our Lord and Governour, he doth not govern us immediately by himself*, (had you said only, it had been true) but hath left the visible and external

ternal conduct and Government of his Church to Bishops, &c. But all the world is agreed that Government containeth Legislation (as the chief act), Judgment and Execution. And hath Christ immediately made no Universal Laws for the Church? Then there are none at all. For he only can make such. When you prove that the Church hath any Universal Law-giver (Personal or Collective) on earth besides Christ, I think I shall turn *Papist*. And hath Christ immediately neither internal Governing motions of his Spirit, nor external Governing mutations of Providence? neither Judicial or Executive Mercies or Judgments?

Pag. 163. They will say that you are a *Papist*, saying, The union of particular Christians to Christ is by their Union with the Christian Church, which consisteth in their regular subjection to their Spiritual Guides and Rulers, and in concord and union among themselves. And oft before, *Pag.* 144, 145, 146, 147, 150, 151. you make our Union with the Church to be first in order of Nature before our Union with Christ. And so Baptism should first unite me to the Priest or Bishop, and then to the rest of the Church, and then to Christ; and should first oblige me to the Bishop, and then to Christ. *Bellarmino* indeed saith, but never proved, that implicitey Baptism obligeth us to the Pope. But this is notoriously contrary to Christianity, and the common sentiments of mankind. When Subjects are united to the King, by the Oath of Allegiance, it is their first political bond, and relation. And that they are united to their fellow-Subjects, as the Kingdom is (at the same time, but) a secondary relation, because the Kingdom consisteth of Individuals united to the King, as King. The Scholar obligeth himself to his Master, to be taught in his School: The first intention, obligation, and relation, is to the Master, and that to the School-fellows, is but secondary, and consequential. So a Believer, in Baptism, giveth up himself to God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, as his God, and Father, his Saviour, and Sanctifier; but he doth this in conjunction with all the Church, and therefore consequently is united to the Church by Baptism; but his first, and chief obligation, and relation, is to Christ. Else, why is not the Church, or Bishop, mentioned in Baptism at all? But that the first union, or relation should be to a Bishop, a fellow-servant, and our fellow-Christians, and to Christ but secondarily by them, is such an Article, as my Creed shall never entertain.

And how can it refer primarily to the Church, and not to every Individual Christian, as p. 142, 143. when it is no way a Church, but as it consisteth of Individuals baptized, and so united to Christ? You may as well say, that Reason first belongeth to the Commonwealth, before it belongeth to Individual persons.

Pag. 96. You most unreasonably cry out on *Ignorance*, and say, *the truest expression of love to our Saviour, is not some fond, and amorous passions, but obedience to his Laws*. Obedience is undeniably necessary in it self, and as an expression of love. But the terms of *fond and amorous passions*, sound profanely. I have heard it a dispute, whether the pure Deity, being immaterial, can be the Object of passionate love; and some said, no; and I said, not the sensible immediate object of it: But the purest acts of the will, here in the body, touch, or move the sensitive affections, which therefore concur, or make all our love (or most) to be a compounded act. And thus God may be sensitively, or passionately loved, and must be. And upon search, you will find it hard to say, that ever there was such a thing as love, or delight in you, which was no whit sensitive passion. But however, none doubteth, but that Christ, as man, is the Object of this sort of love. And is love the very spirit in us, and our very holiness, and the more excellent way, and everlasting perfective act, which can never be too much? And shall we call it, fond, and amorous passion? I profess, I know no other Heaven than God, the final Object, and perfect love. God clearly seen, the perfect Act, conjunct with the perfect Reception of his love, and pleasing of his will in both. And having oft read their Controversies, I never found the least inclination to think, that *Aquinas* was in the right, that Beatitude is only, or chiefly in Intellection; but that *Scotus*, and the rest, most certainly prove, that Love is the end of Vision; and Beatitude is more finally and eminently in the Will: and *Medina*, and the rest of the *Thomists*, are triflers in their Argumentations hereupon: But I little doubt, but the Third sort are in the right, that make Beatitude to consist in neither alone, but the Complex of our Active and Passive perfections. And how much more savoury is it to me, to read honest *Gerson*, and other Papists Treatises of Love, and Mr. *Boyles Seraphick Love*, &c. than the name of *fond, and amorous passions to*
Christ,

Christ, when I know that God first looketh at the heart, and that our joy must be at the heart, and that I find no joy without passion, and passionate love, and find how wofully I want such holy passion? And yet I doubt not, but many mistaken people, lay more of their sincerity on passion, and less on obedience than they ought to do, to their great delusion. But love hath an excellency above obedience it self, formally considered: *Deus potentissimus est motor, Deus sapientissimus Rector, Deus optimus est finis & amabilissimus*; obedience is due to him, as *Rector*; which is but *rerum & motuum ordinator*; but love is his due finally, for his *infinite goodness*. And though love, because commanded, is the chief material part of obedience; yet *formaliter*, it hath a more excellent nature than obedience, and therefore is the final Act. And your words, p. 95. are bitter, calling a *formal contract* with Christ (which doubtless is Baptism, and Christianity in it self), the *working of a heated fancy, and Religious distraction*. Pray that you never have worse distraction. I am against over-terrifying the people, as well as you, and against requiring the observation of the method of Conversion you speak of, as necessary in all. But the Ancient Church, that trained up the Catechumens for Baptism, led them along to a contract with Christ, by such steps as you call a Religious distraction. And he that hath lived wickedly at Age, must be brought to a heart-contract with Christ, by such steps as the Church brought men to Baptism, though he must not be re-baptized. P. 72, 73. have harsh passages; and p. 75. is more harsh, *Acquaintance with Christs person*, being the first part of our Christianity, should not be a scorn: Nor should you have said, *Here is every jot and tittle of reason it is founded on, and pretends to*, when near a Horse-load of Lutherans, and Bishops, and other Protestants books, have given abundance more. Much less should you have said of that, which so many Protestants, even Prelates, have copiously wrote for, even the strongest defenders of Prelacy, as Bishop Downham, Davenant, &c. *I think there needs no more, to expose it to the scorn of every considering man, who cannot but discover how inconsistent the Religion of Christs Person, and his Doctrine are*; where you confess, that scorn is the end of the Writer.

But I have presumed too far on your patience, and therefore pass by more, p. 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 50, 55, 57, 59, &c. I will add but one thing more.

2. You have made so fore a temptation for your self, that it grieveth me at the heart, to foresee your danger. Some men will tell the world of these errors of yours, as lowd as you have proclaimed theirs, and expose you to dislike; as you have done them to scorn: Yea, your words have so ill a sound, that the greatest part (I think) of serious religious people, will think as bad of your book, as they do of *Dr. Parker's*; and all places will sound with your dispraise. And this will be to you so strong a temptation to destroy all your Charity to them, and turn your heart into an utter Enmity to them, that it must be eminent mercy, fortifying your humility, which must make you escape it: And if you escape it not, you are an undone man. And those that put the best construction on your words, will say, Was it meet for him to expose others to scorn, for unmeet words, who could no better word his own conceptions, than to seem to overthrow all Religion, whatever he meant? Sir, though your concession embolden me to talk thus freely to you, I know it will be hard for you to take well even these secret lines from me; For self will feel, till it be mortified. When (to lenifie you) I must profess to you, that I do it for your good, and warp not to a party: Doctrinals are usually so much higher, in our esteem, than Forms, that, if I were partial, it were like to be for you, with whom (if you hold not worse than I hope you do) I agree against the rigid sense of imputation. But I have felt in my self some part of your disease: When I wrote my first Book, I fell on *Mr. Walker, Dr. Owen, &c.* about Five and Twenty years ago: and I thought I ought to save men from the hurt of all the mistaking Books I met with, not knowing how meddling with persons tendeth to dissention, and alienations, and how much better it is to meddle with the Cause, and Arguments. I have long wish't *Mr. Shepherd* had been more judicious: But *Mr. Firmin* hath more charitably, yet freely animadverted on his words, and *Mr. Hookers*, and *Mr. Daniel Rogers*, and *Mr. Perkins* (with some of mine) than you have done. And a few Independents in these points, about free grace, speak not the common sense of the Nonconformists. I intreat you to pardon the plainness of these lines, intended for your self alone: But whether you do that, or not, I earnestly beg of you, that you will use all means, that the entertainment, and Answers of your Book, may not destroy your

Cha-

Charity to the Dissenters , and turn your heart against them with that bitterness, which interest will be apt to tempt you to. And O that your own explications, and retractions, might prevent, or break the strength of this temptation. I rest

Dec. 24.

1673.

An unfeigned esteemer of your Parts,

and desirer of your Welfare,

Ri. Baxter.

His Answer followeth.

Reverend Sir,

I Received your Letter, but have been so hurried from one place to another, this *Christmas*, that I have not had time for my necessary occasions, which has forc't me to delay an Answer. But now I return you my thanks for your kind intentions towards me, and for your plain and open dealing; for I presume, Sir, you did not expect that I should give you a particular Answer to all your Objections, which would be, to write a Book instead of a Letter, which at present I am not at leisure to do; and many of the Objections are such, that I am confident you can answer them your self, and save me that labour; though I heartily thank you for acquainting me, what other men will say, who have not so much understanding, nor ingenuity as your self; which I hope will contribute much to break the force of that temptation you speak of: For, Sir, whatever becomes of my reputation, if any man convince me of a mistake, I resolve to own it; and as for those, who have no rule to judge by, but passion, and interest, and have no other way of confuting Books, but by bold, and groundless slanders, I have nothing at all to say to them; and though this way is of late too much in vogue amongst those who pretend highly to Religion, yet I hope I shall be far enough from the temptation of such examples: For though, Sir, you are pleased sometimes with Acrimony enough, to charge my

my Writings with Scorn and Acrimony, yet I find other wise and good men have a better opinion of them ; and upon the most cool and deliberate reflections , were I to write it again, excepting some few passages, which are rather merry than sharp, I know not how I could have writ otherwise , without being wanting to the Cause I managed. But it is no more than I expected , that different men would pass different censures upon my Book, which is the fate of all Books that ever were writ : And this I considered before I writ, and therefore am not surprized at it now. I value my Reputation, as all wise men ought to do, but yet I am not afraid of being reproach'd in a good Cause, in which I shall have the company of the best men that ever were in the world. It is not victory I contended for, but truth ; and therefore am no more concerned to defend any thing I have writ, than I am to find out and defend the truth ; and shall be so far from being angry with any man who shall confute me, and convince me of a mistake , that I shall heartily thank him for it : And for that reason, I once more return my hearty thanks to you, for appearing so much concerned to rectifie those mistakes you apprehend me to be guilty of ; and subscribe my self,

Your obliged Friend, and Servant,

Will. Sherlock.

C H A P. III.

Of the manner of their Confutation of us by Reproach and Noise.

§. 1. **T**Here is so much difference between Dr. Sherlock's judgment and mine, as to the *Order* and *Manner* of such Disputes, or Writings, as pretend to make known Truth and Falshood , that I have little hope of ever profiting by his method. He first over-passeth a fair discussion of the things

things which we have told him we dissent from: And what he pretendeth to justify against our contrary thoughts, is handled with such heaps of unsatisfactory words, as may amaze, or confound, or divert the unskilful, but need no reply to such as understand the state of the controversie, and the force of an argument, and will compare his words with mine.

I have long unfeignedly desired, 1. That they that still say, *there is no sin imposed on us*, would give us some such evidence of the lawfulness of all the things which I have named in my first *Plea for Peace*, as the matter of our dissent, as may satisfy the Consciences of such as truly search into the sense, and case, and dare not venture on such dreadful sin as I there described: That they will, without fraudulent forcing words, shew us the error of our doubts, and the lawfulness of all the Oaths, Declarations, Promises, and Subscription, and Practices there excepted against; Were it but the denying Christian Baptism, to such as think their sort of Godfathers undertaking, and the use of the Symbolical crossing to be sinful; when yet they seem to ascertain salvation to the baptized, if not to leave the unbaptized as condemned.

And that the new Article of Faith there, about the certainty of salvation of baptized Infants, without exception, is verily certain by the Word of God.

And that it's lawful to deny the Eucharist to all that dare not take it kneeling, or be confirmed, as our Bishops do. When Mr. *Dodwell*, and such other tell us, that those that receive not the Sacrament (even from such as he describeth), or that suffer themselves to be shut out of Communion in such a case, have no Covenant-right to salvation: And so if I deny them Baptism, or the Eucharist, what cruelty do I use, though they were faulty, if I might give it them? Many more such things I expected a justification of, by solid proof, before I consent to them.

2. And when I had so oft, and largely distinguished of separation, and shewed in how many cases we renounce it, and in what senses and cases we take it to be a duty, I had hoped, that ere this, some of these Doctors that write and talk so much against *Separation* and *Schism*, would have endeavoured to shew me, that Separation is a sin in some one of those many particular cases, in which I take it to be none, or to be a duty.

3. And

3. And when in a Treatise of Episcopacy, I have given them so full an account, why we dare not swear, and subscribe for it, as is required, I hoped some one would have shewn us, by a reasonable Answer, what it is that should change our judgment, and warrant us to swear, never to endeavour any alteration.

4. And when I wrote my Apology for our Preaching (which is made our Schism, and the intollerable crime which deserveth our ruin in the common Goals), some one would have shewed us the error of our Arguments, if we mistake. But instead of this, we have such writings sent out against us, as I will not here name as they deserve, but have fully answered in my several Defences of my first *Plea for Peace*.

And if we do but manifest undeniably to the Reader, the gross errors, confusions, fallacies, notorious falsehoods in matter of fact, which any of them would deceive their Readers, and tear the Church by, we are called *Proud*, and *Railers*, for supposing that we speak trulier than they: As many, and many a time I have known common drunkards and Blasphemers say of those godly men that urged them to repentance, *You are proud Pharisees, and hypocrites, that say, I thank thee, Lord, that I am not as this Publican. You are as bad, and worse than we.* And then they were safe from motions to repentance.

6. 2. As to their casting on us the *odium* of the late Wars; and as Bishop *Gunning's* Chaplain, calling us over and over, *cruel*, and bloody Sectaries, as if their own reviling would warrant men to destroy us: And as to the *Persons* that we have to deal with, I must desire the Reader to remember, 1. That before the Kings Restoration, almost all that had any Church-benefices, used the Directory instead of the Common Prayer, and conformed to the times, as much as we did, that are now silenced.

2. That therefore of 9200, or 10000. Ministers, 7000, or 8000. that conformed, had before lived like the rest: So that all the reproaches that are cast on the late Ministry from 1646, till 1660, belong as much more to the Conformists, than to the Nonconformists, as 7000, or 8000. are more than 2000.

3. That the most of the Nonconformists, now living (I think more than ten to one), had no more hand in Wars, or deposing the Bishops, than their accusers; being either at Schools, or

Uni-

Universities, or not meddling in such things.

4. That the new upstart zealots, that plead for our ruin, and the execution of the Laws against us, as Schismatical Separatists, were too young to have any of the honour of the Kings Restoration, but rise up to reap the fruit of other mens Loyalty (such as were the Presbyterian Commanders of General *Monk's* Army, and the Lord Mayor (Sir *Thomas Allen*), yet living), and the Presbyterian Ministers of *London*, who perswaded him, and the *Londoners*, to draw in General *Monk* for the King, &c.) and now cry us down, as Rogues for the Goal, and talk revilingly of persons, and things which they never knew, because they are trained up to Notions, and Inclinations, more suitable to Prelatical grandure and domination, than we.

§. 3. And yet I must truly tell the Reader, that I desire not to hide any of the worth of our slanderers, revilers, or persecutors. Man is a creature of a marvellous mixture: It's a wonder how so much good and evil can dwell together in the same breast. Forgive the freedom of my instance: I have heard Mr. *Sherlocke* Preach wholesom Truths; and yet his contentious writings are so false, so injudicious, so malignant, that out of the same Fountain cometh sweet Water and bitter.

Who would think, that read Dr. *Parker's Eccles. Polity*, and Preface to Bishop *Bramhall*, that he is the same man, that hath lately written a Defence of Natural and Christian Religion? A Book that constraineth me to forgive him his great virulency.

A great deal of laudible Industry and Learning, is manifest in Mr. *Morrice* his Vindication of the Prelatical Usurpations, under the name of the Primitive Church. I rejoyce there are any men of so much diligence, and worth. But this is the same man who distorteth Church-History, as making those Bishops and Councils, the great means of the Churches Concord, who have confounded it, and divided it into the many great bodies which are visible to this day (*viz. Papists, Greeks, Nestorians, Jacobites, Armenians, Abassines, and Protestants.*)

§. 4. And it is a wonder to me, that all the 7000, or 8000. that turned to Conformity, while many of them reproach the Nonconformists, for former compliances with Usurpers, do none

of them, or no more, accuse themselves. In my acquaintance, it was those that since conformed, that took the Engagement, excluding the King and House of Lords, when I wrote against it; and those that now are Nonconformists refused it, as to the greater part, proportionably compared together.

The difference then between the 7000, or 8000. and 2000. must be, that the 7000 repented when the 2000 did not. And Mr. *Morrice* taketh occasion to stigmatize the Nonconformists as enemies to repentance, for their Reputation sake, when I spake of the *peccavimus*, which the mutable Bishops pronounced in their Councils upon the turn of the times. I love repentance, and love the means that tend to bring me to it: But to run all one way, in one Princes Reign, and curse it in the next, and turn again in the next, with a *peccavimus*, is not so good as constant adhering to the truth. When Mr. *Barret* tells Dr. *Stillingfleet*, how he came and Preach't in his Church without his knowledg and consent, on a day of publick solemnity, commanded by the Usurpers for their successes, when Mr. *Barret* refused to keep the day, and staid at home; I would ask, Whether Mr. *Barret* do now deserve scorn or suffering for what he did then, more than Dr. *Stillingfleet*? And when, where, and how did they publish repentance for all those years of Church-obedience to the Usurpers, unless it was by changing with the times, and subscribing, declaring, and taking Benefices, and near 7000 professing Assent and Consent to all things contained in, and prescribed by a book which they had never seen (the Press having not finished it in time)?

I blame not their *peccavimus*. But why, have we no more of their self-accusation in it, but rather accusing those that did as they did then, because they dare not do as they do now. And how came *Bartholomew*-day, 1662. to be so happy a day, as to bring at once 7000. to sudden understanding and repentance, that never shewed that repentance till then?

§ 5. But what are all these things to the deciding of our present case, whether our imposed Conformity be lawful? And whether, if it be, we deserve silencing and Goals for thinking and doing otherwise? But to bring an *odium* on the persons who dissent from them, is some mens chief Consolation of their Cause. But verily, if it must go by the persons true piety and honesty, bare

bare words of accusation will not easily change those mens regard to the Nonconformists, who have been many years well acquainted with both sides. But if the stronger side be the right, I have been mostly in the wrong, unless we take God for our strength.

§. 6. For my part, I charitably judg the best of most that suddenly conformed, that they took neither way of Government or Worship to be unlawful, and therefore did conform to both, as they thought necessity required. That this was Dr. *Stillingfleet's* thoughts, his *Irenicon* fully sheweth: Even as a Parliament, and *Westminster-Synod*, who had conformed before, did turn against it, when they thought necessity, or the state of the Church required it. And yet our present Church-Fathers like not the mutability of these Conformists.

§. 7. And I can truly say, That in all Counties of my acquaintance, it was those men (though never engaged in the Wars, or changes, coming since from the Universities) who excelled the greater part of the Ministers in heart-searching, heavenly fervent preaching and prayer, in diligent catechizing, and instructing the people, and watchful care of all their souls, in greatest care of true reformation of all sensuality and wickedness, and in the most blameless conversation, and seriousness in seeking their own and other mens salvation, and eminent charity to their power. I say, it was these men that were turned out, and silenced as Nonconformists: Yea, besides these that came younger, or since the change, even those that had been old Conformists, that were of the same temper of conscience, went out with them. Yea, one of my next Neighbours, that had been constant for the King against the Parliament, and since the War, deep in endeavours against them, but of too loose a life, since dating his conversion, as he judged it, from some Sermons, which meddled with no matters of Conformity, or Controversie, and becoming a serious Preacher, and of a new life, he proved a Nonconformist of greater resolution than the rest: For his change being not commonly known, he had no encouragement from other Nonconformists, nor scarce any acquaintance with them, they shunning him as the Christians at first did *Paul*, and he being private and modest, so that I had never any speech with him my self.

I speak these instances, as giving a truer description than strangers, imbibed by interest, or faction, give. I must say, that among all my acquaintance, I could before-hand so far judge by the very complexion of their consciences and lives (not by their enmity to Bishops, but by the foresaid Characters) who were the men that would not conform: And though I was 100, or 120. Miles from them when the time came (1662), and never wrote a word to them about it, my conjectures did not fail me in above three or four, that I remember. And of some that had been in Arms against the King, I did truly prognosticate, that they would conform: Yea, some that had written for the Engagement, and much more; even that rare man of knowledge, who in his Treatise of Policy (Eccles. and Civil) hath written that of the Kings death which I will not name, I made no question would conform, when others that wrote against it would not.

§. 8. The truth is, as far as I can perceive, the most fiery of the old Bishops and Conformists, were strangers to the men that they revile, even while they lived near them: And the younger sort judge of them by the revilings of the elder, and by the weaknesses of some *Antinomians*, or erroneous odd persons, or ignorant women that they hap't to meet with. I thought of their case when *Serenus Cressy* (sometime a Protestant Dean) sent me his Edition of *Baker's Book*, and told me, that he turned from the Protestant Religion, because there was no spiritual prayer and contemplation among them. I sent him my answer, that it was Gods just judgment on such as he, that upon others calumnies had made themselves strangers or enemies to godly Protestants, nick-named Puritans, that while they lived so near them, they did not know them; and for want of knowing such as dwelt among them, and whom they persecuted, should turn Papists to seek for such as they. But this the devil hath got by Faction.

§. 9. I find, that *some one thing* seemeth so great to most men, that they reduce almost all their other conceptions to the interest of that.

The Nonconformists, for the generality, so much look at *serious godliness*, and extirpation of sin, that some of them have been

been tempted into unlawful compliances, or means which seemed to them likely to attain it, and too much to oppose Liturgies and Forms, as thinking that they were used to mortifie and extinguish it.

The Statesmen that were most for *Property* and *Liberty* of the Subject, have some of them been tempted to think those Principles and Parties best that served this end: and many were inclined to *Erastianism* hereby.

The great Men of the earth, who are still for being greater, and absolute, and unlimited in Power or Will, are liable to the temptation to be for that Party and Opinion in Religion, which serveth this interest and end: And when Protestants will deliver them from Papal Tyranny, they are for the Protestants: And when Papists will promise to make them Absolute, they think by this to win them to be Papists, (that is, to be *Slaves to the Pope*, that they may be *Absolute*, and not to be tied to a loving Fatherly Government; so much doth sin contradict itself!)

And if men once get a strong false conceit, that all Christians in the world must have a visible, unifying Church-power under Christ, and that this is a Council while it sits, and all the Bishops of the world as one Colledge, when there is no Council; and so that the Council of *Constance*, and *Basil*, and the *French* Papists that set Councils above the Pope, as to the Form of Church-Government, are in the right; and that the true Reformation of the Church lyeth, in getting *France* and *England* united in the Collegiate or Council-Supremacy, getting them to abate (or allow us to forbear) the Sacrament only in one kind, the Adoration of Angels and Saints, Transubstantiation, Priests celebrate, and the *Latin Mass*: And that this Union with the Conciliar part of Papists is to be called, *The Reformed Religion*; and is the only way to the peace and prosperity of the Church; I say, when this once is rooted in mens minds, what wonder if so great a thing as the supposed Interest of the Universal Church, and Christian Religion, do make them think odiously of all that are against it, and overlook their Piety and Honesty, and vilifie all their Reasons and Defences, and even think it needful to destroy or ruine them, as a service acceptable to Christ? All their thoughts and studies will run in this channel, to serve this espoused End and Error.

§. 10. But I have so far detected these mistakes in my Book of *Concord*, and answered their Accusations in my *Apology*, [p. 92.] that

that I will thither refer the Reader that is willing to know the truth, whether Dr. *Sherlocke*, Bishop *Gunning's* Chaplain (Dr. *Saywell*) and the rest who dispute in that Mood and Figure, do wisely, justly, and truly use the mention of the days of Usurpation and the late Wars, and the Treasons of those that kill'd the King, as a Topick of that force, as they pretend, for the deciding of the Controversies between the Nonconformists and Conformists; and proving it well done to Silence and Imprison such as never meddled with Wars, if they will not Conform, or cease their Ministry to which they were devoted.

C H A P. IV.

Of the main matter of our Difference, viz. The essential Form of the Catholick, National, and single Churches.

§ 1. **M**R. *Humphrey* hath said so much on this subject to Dr. *Sherlocke*, as may allow me to be the briefer: But because it is the Foundation-difference, I must not wholly let it pass.

I. It greatly concerns all Christians to know what the Catholick, that is, the Christian Universal Church is; because it is that which every Christian must be and is a Member of, and it is an Article of our Creed. Had Mr. *Thorndike*, Mr. *Dodwel*, Bishop *Gunnings* Chaplain, and such others truly defined it, they had not been to be blamed for laying so great a stress on that Article, and calling us all to unite in the Catholick Church. Nor are the Papists to be blamed for doing this, but for a false Definition of the Church.

§ 2. It is an Article which I have above these thirty years been so much for our belief and careful observance of, that it hath not been the least cause to alienate me both from *French* and *Italian* Popery. The Catholick Church, which I believe, is so much greater than that which any of the men forementioned plead for, that I cannot consent to reduce it to their narrow compass, and turn it into a Sect, if not to deny it and turn it out of the world, as I think some of them do. And Union and Communion with it (being

(being essential to Christianity) is another thing, more extensive and more intelligible than these Humanists feign it to be. Undoubtedly the Catholick Church is nothing more or less than the *Christian Church* as such; that is, *All Christians united to Christ the Head*. I thought the great number of Protestant-Writers against Popery, particularly Dr. *Challoner* on that Article of the *Creed*, had put this out of controversie among Protestants; and now it comes to be the chief of our Controversies, while we hold to the old Definitions of the Bishops and Conformists.

§ 3. I shall first briefly, but plainly, explain the Protestant Doctrine, by answering these following Questions.

Quest. 1. Whether the Catholick Church, as in the *Creed*, and as in the Councils, be of the same signification?

2. Whether the Catholick Church, as in the *Creed*, be a Political Society specified and united by its formal Government?

3. Whether the Catholick Church, as in the *Creed*, be visible, and how far?

4. What maketh a man a Member of the Catholick Church, and who are such?

5. Whether the great Seats of Christians now famous in the world, be of the Catholick Church, or which of them?

And then I shall consider of Mr. *Sherlock's*, Bishop *Gunning's*, Dr. *Saywell's*, and Mr. *Dodwells*, and Mr. *Thorndike's*, and such others description of the *Catholick Church*, and of the *French Papists* that are for the Supremacy of Councils.

Quest. 1. The Catholick Church, as in the *Creed*, a necessary Article of our Faith, is the whole Body or Church of *Christ* on Earth, within and without the *Roman Empire*. And so it is oft used by the Fathers and Councils. But by them it is oft taken in a narrower sense, for all those Churches in the *Roman Empire*, which retained the true Faith, and approved Communion, as distinct from Separating and Anathematized Hereticks; as they call; that Council *General* (as the *Septuagint* the name of a *General Assembly* in their Nation) which was gathered out of all or the most of the *Roman Empire*, though none of the extraneous Churches were there, or called to it; so used they the name of the *Catholick Church*, (which I again say, I have so fully proved against *Johnson*, that I will not repeat.)

Ans. 2. The *Catholick Church*, as in the *Creed*, is a noble, eminent,

ment, Political Society, constituted of Christ, the specifying and unifying Head, and of all Christians his Subjects, or the Members.

Where I must tell you, what we mean by a *Political Society*, and of what *species* this in question is.

They that will be understood, must use words in the sense as they are ordinarily used by the Masters and Professors of the Art or Science which they belong to. The common definition of *Politica* is, that it is *Legitima ordinatio Reipublicæ secundum quam aliis præsumt alii parent*: of which three *species*, Monarchy, Aristocracy and Democracy are commonly known: of a *Mixt*, there is controversy. It is sometime taken for the action *vs. veritas* of the *Rector*; sometime for the *ipsa Civitas, vel Respublica*: for the matter as informed by Rectoral Relation: The people as united to a Formal Governing Head. Hence *Politica* is *Disciplina de Reipublica, vel civilis Societatis gubernatione*. We have in disputing this, nothing to do with the equivocal looser senses of the word: For so it is applied to Monastical Rules of Life by Contract; to Superstitious self-afflicting Disciplines; yea, to Bees, Ants, &c.

A *Politie*, or *Respublica*, is *Civilis* or *Ecclesiastica*; of this last Divines have variously and largely written: Hooker and many others entitle their Books *Of Ecclesiastical Politie*: *Spalatensis* very learned Volumes are *de Republicâ Ecclesiasticâ*, (the most considerable that ever I saw written, for a middle way, between the rigid Papist and Protestant) The Church hath its true, proper, specifying and unifying, that is, constitutive Government: Therefore it is truly a *Political Society*. It is the peculiar Kingdom of Christ.

The *Species* then is *Monarchical*, but transcendent: As Christ is God, it is a *Theocracy*; as he is Man, it is *eminently humane*. It essentially includeth DOMINION, or absolute Propriety, and the greatest Love or Friendship; and so is A PATERNAL KINGDOM WITH ABSOLUTE DOMINION FOUNDED IN THE RIGHT OF REDEMPTION, ADDED TO THAT OF CREATION.

A Polity is formally a Relation, and accordingly to be defined.

The Catholick Church, as every *Political Society*, is *unum formale*, or *per se*: It is not *ens & unum per meram aggregationem*, as a heap of sand is *one* heap, or a crowd of men is *one* company: Nor is it a Community of men in equal relation. If there

there be not a *pars Regens vel Imperans*, and a *pars Subdita*; and if these two be not (as Soul and Body) the *Constitutive parts*, it is no Political Society or Republick: and the *Regent* part is the *Informing* part: If it have not *ONE Regent part*, it is not *ONE Society* as Political: If it have *None*, it is *no Politie*: If it have *many*, it is many. Every Political Body hath *ONE HEAD* only, that is, *Supreme Constitutive (specifying and unifying) Governour*. The various *species*, Monarchy, Aristocracy, and Democracy, cross not this. In Aristocracy and Democracy the constitution decreeth, how many Voices shall have the Determining Supreme Power: Perhaps the major Vote, perhaps two third parts, perhaps all must agree. And this Supreme determining Power or Number, is *Una persona Politica*, as in the Senate of *Venice*, and as was that of *Rome*, &c. though they were an hundred or thousand *Personae naturales*: It is then most certain, that Christ being a real and eminent Supreme Ruler of the Church, it is really one Political Society, as informed by Union of the Head and Body.

Quest. But is there any other informing, specifying, unifying, Supreme Power to the Catholick Church?

Ans. As it was equivocally or limitedly called *Catholick*, because it was the whole Imperial Church, so an accidental Head was set over it; that is, the Emperour, who governed it by the Power of the Sword. And he finding the Churches used to voluntary Councils for Agreement, turned them into a *seeming Regiment and Sovereignty*: I say, *seeming*. For whereas before the differing Parties Excommunicated one another as they pleased: Afterward the Emperour joyning his execution by the Sword (which was often Banishment) to that Excommunication which was made by a *General Council*, this conjunction made it a sort of *Regiment*; though still the Church as a Church could but Excommunicate, and so others might do by the major Vote if the cause were just, as well as the major Vote might do by the Dissenters. And hence many Expositors of the *Revelations*, who think that by the *Beast* is meant the *Imperial Power*, do think that by the *Image of the Beast* was meant this new *Chergy-regiment* of General Councils, made up of the Pope and other Patriarchs, and the Bishops of that Empire. And the *Life* that was put into this *Image*, was this animating of Excommunications and Anathematizing with

the adjoynd force of the Sword. But this humane *Kingdom*, or *Catholick Church*, was only in one Empire.

Quest. But was not Excommunicating an Act of Government, and consequently a proof of a Regent Supremacy in Councils or Popes?

Ans. Both Rulers and Equals may Excommunicate. When a Pastor excommunicateth one of his Flock, it is an act of Regiment: when a Bishop excommunicateth another Bishop, or one Church another Church, or one Synod another Country, it is but a declaration of equals, that they renounce Communion with such men. Even a Lay-man is bound to avoid an Heretick, nor to bid him *God speed*, and with such men not to eat, yea though he were a Clergy-man: But this is not an Act of Government in this Lay-man, but of Self-preservation and Obedience to God.

Object. But a Ministers Office respects all the world; and his Office containeth Spiritual Government by the Keys: Therefore whenever he exerciseth his Office, he doth it as a Governor, where-ever it be.

Ans. These things require distinct Considerations: 1. The Teaching Power is first to be exercised to make men Christs Disciples, and afterward the Governing-power (as Christ himself did.) If you will call Teaching Governing, because it is done by an Authorized Minister of Christ, or by a Nunciative power, then he that preacheth a Visitation-Sermon, governs the Bishop and all the present Clergy.

2. He that exerciseth the Keys on an Equal or Superior, doth it but *ex Authoritate Nuntii*, and not *Restem*. E. g. I think all agree, that Absolution is the exercise of the Keys; and that a simple Priest may Absolve a penitent dying Bishop, Is he therefore his Governor? If this were not so, how sad a Case is the Pope in, that hath no Superior to Absolve him? And who shall Absolve the Patriarchs, Primates, the Archbishop of Canterbury, &c? Must they be Unabsolved till a General Council do it?

3. He that useth the Keys unlawfully, and as a Ruler over those that he hath no rule over, doth but bind himself and not others; he receiveth no such power from God: Therefore it is no act of power, but a Nullity. Our Judges power reaches to all the Counties in England: But yet what they do extrajudicially and *extra proprium forum*, is Null, also this Opinion would make every Priest or Bishop a kind of Pope to govern all the world.

4. Yet in a more Case, that in almost all ages Bishops have mutually Excommunicated one another, and Councils Anathematized each

each other: And at this day a great part of the Christian world do mutually Excommunicate each other, or renounce each others Communion: Are they therefore mutual *Rulers* of each other? Or must we know which is the Regent part before we can know the validity of their Curses? The Patriarchs (set up in the Empire only, and keeping up a pretended power now the Empire is dissolved) are of several Sects condemning one another.

One of the chief of the *Papists* Arguments for the Pope, *That he hath Excommunicated other Patriarchs and Kingdoms; and therefore had the Government of them.*

But then 1. a *Subapostle* that Excommunicateth all the world, is the Ruler of the world: And a Scold that can curse King and Kingdom, is thereby proved to be their Governour. 2. And then when *Dioscorus*, *Menas*, and other Patriarchs did Excommunicate the Pope, they were his Governours: The *British* and *Scottish* Clergy would not eat and drink in the same house with *Augustine* Romish Clergy: Doth it follow, that they took themselves for their Governours.

I have told you what we mean by *Politics* and a *Political Society*, as distinct from a multitude, or mere Community: We speak in the language of all ordinary Politicks. If our Accusers will take Political terms in another sense, if it be through Ignorance, let them learn the Doctrine of Politicks, before they shame themselves by proclaiming their Ignorance to the world: If it be (as our new Reformers of Logick and Philosophy) by shewing how much wiser they are than all the Masters of Politicks till now, let them give us a new System of Politicks, with their proofs and confutations of the old.

III. Q. *Whether the Catholick Church in the Creed be Visible?*

Ans. Here are three Answers commonly given: 1. Some Protestants think, that it is only the *Elect*, and *Sanctified*, and *Adopted* as such, (who shall all be saved) that are the Catholick Church meant in the *Creed*; because it is the *Object of Faith*, and therefore not of *sight*.

2. *Papists* think it is visible so far as to have a *Visible, Humane, Sovereign, unifying Governour* under Christ: About which they are (as *Bellarmin* fully tells us) of three minds (at least) 1. Some say, that this Supreme Power is in the Pope; 2. Some say, (as the Councils of *Pisa*, *Constance* and *Basil*) that it is in *General Councils*.

Councils. 3. And some say, it is in neither alone, but both agreeing, or in a Council confirmed by the Pope.

3. The true resolution is, that the Universal Church is in some respects invisible, and in some visible; as a man is invisible as to his soul, and visible as to his body. The form of a beast, a plant; and every living thing is invisible, but the matter is visible, and so is its Organical contexture but hardly and imperfectly known by the skilfullest Anatomist. What other answer would you give to a Questionist like one of ours, when he asks, whether a tree, a man, a bird be visible? The Divine Nature and Soul of Christ is invisible to such senses as ours. The internal faith and holiness, and the souls of the Catholics, are invisible. Christ's body was visible long on Earth; His glorified body is now visible in the Heavens. He will visibly come to judge the world, and be visible to us for ever. His Universal Laws are visible: His Officers in their several Provinces are visible: The bodies of all the faithful here are visible: The profession of their faith and holiness in Baptism, and holy worship, and communion, and practice, is visible. Call it how you will, thus far it is visible. If any will say, that the King seen only by his Courtiers, is not visible to the main body of the Kingdom; and therefore the Kingdom is not visible, they have liberty of Phrase, but we may lawfully speak otherwise: but let them not pretend, that the difference about *Names* is the same as about *Things*. If Dr. Sherlock say again, *Give over your stating of cases, and give us your arguments*, let him scorn on: I speak to others.

IV. Quest. *What maketh a member of the Catholick Church?*

Ans. This I have so fully opened and proved in my Book of *Concord*, that it irketh me to repeat it. The *soul* is the Constitutive part of man, as Rational and Animate. The body is the Constitutive part of man, as Corporeal: Not *any* body, but a *humane organized body*. So the *Souls Faith and Covenant consent*, is the Constitutive qualification of a Christian, or member of the Catholick Church, as *invisible*, and known only to God: And the *Profession of the faith and consent to the Baptismal Covenant*, is the Constitutive qualification of a Christian, or member of the Church, as *visible*. And the regular making of this Constitutive profession, is by solemn Baptismal covenanting, which is to be

continued by the performance of that Covenant.

Christ made the Summary Creed, *Mat.* 28. 19. It was quickly explained in that called the Apostles Creed. This (at least in sense) was taught men, and profest by them, as to Assent and Consent, before they, or their Infants, were baptized. Baptism solemnizeth this Consent. All thus Baptized, were Christened. All Christians were Members of Christ and his Church Catholick. All Christians and Church-Members were commanded to hear Christs Ministers, and live in love and peace with one another, and thereby to be known to be his Disciples. That such meer Baptism without any more, made men Church Members, I fully proved, as aforecited, *Concord, lib. 2. p. 142, 143, &c. cap. 1, 2, 3, 4.*

V. *Quest. What Sects of Christians now in the world are of the Catholick Church?*

Ans. This is necessary to be understood when the Canoneers talk of a supreme Government over the whole Church, and that those only are of the Church that hold Communion with it, and that this Communion lieth in obedience to this supreme Government, that it may be known of what extent they make their Catholick Church, and how many they cut off by confining it to a Sect.

I. One Sect of Christians are the Papists, who are so many, that their deceiving Priests would make the ignorant believe, that before *Luther's* time they were all the Christian world.

II. The Reformed Catholicks, called Protestants, are a Party indeed, but deserve not the name of a Sect; for their Religion is nothing but *simple Christianity*, protesting against the Papal corruptions: Though their minuter differences have made some called *Lutherans*, some *Calvinists*, some *Episcopal*, some *Presbyterians*, some *Independents*, and some *Politicians*, or *Erasmians*, to say nothing of *Anabaptists* (who as they differ only in the point of Infant-baptism, would have been tolerated by such as *Tertullian* and *Gregory Nazianzen*, who perswaded the delay of Baptism; and by the primitive Churches, which for many hundred years left all to their liberty when to be baptized, and ~~and~~ till they sought it).

III. The

III. The Greek Christians are under the Patriarch of *Constantinople* (having no capacity to call General Councils): How many Kingdoms (or rather captivated Nations now) are under him, you may see in *Bellon. Observ. l. 1. c. 35.* and *Brierwood, p. 125.* and others. And *Thomas a sancto Jesu*, among others, tells us what their Religion is; as *Brierwood* also doth, *p. 127.* and *Possesine de reb. Moscov. p. 38, 39, &c.*

The *Moscovites* I joyn with the *Grecians*, as being in the main of the same Religion and Communion, though the Emperor hath taken the Patriarchs power to himself and his.

IV. The Christians, called *Nestorians*, as Travellers have recorded, are exceeding numerous in a great part of the *East*, saith *Brierwood*, besides the Countries of *Babylon*, *Affyria*, *Mesopotamia*, *Parthia* and *Media*, wherein many are found; that Sect is spread *Northerly*, to *Cataya*; and *Southerly*, to *India*: And *Paulus Venetus*, a Traveller, tells you of them in many Provinces of *Tartary*, as in *Cassar*, *Samarcham*, *Charcham*, *Chinchintelas*, *Tangush*, *Sicchir*, *Ergimul*, *Tenduc*, *Caraiam*, *Mangi*, &c. Their chief Governing Patriarch is at *Muzal* in *Mesopotamia*: As to their Religion, their Accusers say it is the same with *Nestorius's*, whom *David Derodourde supposito* hath largely defended as Orthodox. But Travellers that have lived among them, tell us, that they differ from us in no point of Faith, but only honour the name of *Nestorius*, and vilifie the name of *Cyris*, and the Councils of *Ephesus*, *Calcedon*, &c. And so are a Sect, but nothing like a Heresie.

V. The *Eutyrians*, called *Jacobites*, are a very numerous Sect in *Syria*, *Mesopotamia*, *Cyprus*, *Babylon*, *Palestine*. Their Patriarch resideth in *Caramis* the Metropolis of *Mesopotamia*, and calleth himself Patriarch of *Antioch* (still named *Ignatius*) and the Patriarch of *Jerusalem* (saith *Brierwood* after many others) is a *Jacobite*, and is under him: The most impartial Papists that have conversed with them, attest, that they differ little from the Orthodox, but in words about the *Eutyrianism*, of which they are accused.

VI. The *Egyptian* Christians called *Copti*, or *Cophi*, though *Jacobites*, are a distinct Sect; as being under the Patriarch of *Alexandria*, (residing in *Cairo* usually.) And all these *Jacobites* chiefly differ from the *Europeans*, by honouring the Names of *Diocletian*, *Severus*, and *Jacobus Zuxalus*, and disclaiming the Council of *Calcedon*, &c.

VII. The great Empire of the *Abassines* (yet after the great diminution,

minution, saith *Brierwood*, as big as *France, Spain, Italy* and *Germany*) though in the main they are *Jacobites*, have divers differences, and have a chief Bishop of their own, chosen by the Monks of *St. Antonies Order* at *Jernsalem*, and confirmed by the Patriarch of *Alexandria*.

VIII. The *Melchites* are of the same Religion with the *Greeks*, but of a different Sect, under their Patriarch of *Antioch* living at *Damascus*. For there being four pretended Patriarchs of *Antioch*, they head three different Sects: I say Three, for the Fourth is a mere creature of the Popes that personates that Patriarch.

The Writers mistake, that think they took this name to themselves. They were nicknamed *Melchitas* in scorn by the *Clergy-Council Zealots*, as men that would be of any Religion that the King was of; because they obeyed the Emperour against the Councils. *Roterus* saith, They are the greatest Sect of Christians in the East.

IX. The *Georgians* are of the *Greek Religion*, but (saith *Brierwood*) in no sort subject (nor ever were) to the Patriarch of *Constantinople*; but all their Bishops, being eighteen, profess obedience to their own *Metropolitan*, without any higher dependence or relation: who yet keepeth his Residence far off in the Hill of *Sinai*. They are the *Iberians*; between the *Euxine* and *Caspian Seas*.

And their Neighbours the *Circassians* and *Mengrelians* are of the *Greek Communion*, yet differ from others, (as not Baptizing Children till they be eight years old, &c. who by our Prelates would be called intolerable Anabaptists, Vid. *Brierwood*, c. 17. p. 135.)

X. The *Armenians* dwell in the Greater *Armenia* (*Turcomania*), and the Lesser *Armenia* and *Cilicia* (*Carmania*). And having a special Patent from *Mahomet*, (as *Possellus* saith) are for their Merchandise spread through the *Turkish Empire*. The *Interior Armenia* was once under *Constantinople*; but they have above a thousand years been withdrawn from that Patriarch, and the Communion of the *Greeks*; and as *Brierwood* saith out of *Rhotius* and *Ravennius*, they detest them more than any Sect of Christians. And it is not a pageant or subornation of the *Papists* that will prove them subject to the Pope of *Rome*. They obey only two *Primates*, called *Catholicks*, of their own: they are superstitiously Religious, especially in Abstinence and Fastings.

XI. The *Maronites* are counted the least Sect of Christians, in Mount

Mount *Lybanus*, sometimes seeming to submit to the Pope; and sometime rejecting him; but being once *Monothelites*, which they have now forsaken.

The *Indian* Christians (or of *St. Thomas*) were long *Nestorians*; and sometimes they submit to *Rome*, and sometime not, and differ from them in many things, of which see *Brierwood*, pag. 146, 147, &c.

Now, Reader, the Question in hand is, Which of all these twelve Parties are parts of the *Catholick Church*? The Church that I believe containeth all these, except the following doubt of the *Papists*: All of them profess to believe all the Essentials of Christianity, and most of the Integrals. Of the Eleven, none (that I can learn) hold any Heresie directly contrary to any Essential point. Those which are charged on their Ancestors, I find not only unproved as to the present Christians, but disproved: *Jac. de Vetrico* cleareth some: *Masius*, translating their Confessions, others; *Thomas a Sancto Jesu* others; *Possevine* some; their own Confessions cited by *Baronius*, *Pretorius*, &c. some. *Zago. Zab. Damian a Goas* and *Godignus* much clear the *Abassines*, (though much ignorant and faulty): *Brochardus* that dwelt among them at *Jerusalem* professeth, that these Eastern Christians are good harmless men, neither owning nor knowing the Heresies charged on them for their Names; but men of better Lives and stricter than even the Religious of the Church of *Rome*, and shaming the *Europeans*. The Arabian *Geographia Nabianensis* (written by a Mahometan) having told us what the Pope is, p. 225. (*In urbe Roma sunt Aedes Regis Papa vocati, nec est supra Papam superioritas in dignitate, & Reges sunt inferiores ipso* :) His Publisher a *Papist*, *Maronite*, *Gabriel Sinia* (p. 43.) confesseth, That all the Christians in the East do believe in Christ the Lord, and the Son of God incarnate for mans Salvation, and with the greatest honour do all reverence his holy Gospel; but tells us of such things as others had charged on them, (as that the Holy Ghost proceeds only from the Father, that there is no Purgatory, &c. But the great thing is, *They deny the Primacy of the Pope, Christ's Vicar on Earth, and hate him and his Subjects*.

The main doubt is of the *Papists*, who are the chief condemners of the rest, of whom I have said; 1. As they are a Church informed by the Papal Monarchy, they are no Church of *Christ*. 2. As they are Christians, they hold all things essential to Christianity.

rianity. 3. As they are corrupt Christians, they hold many Errors corrupting Christianity. 4. Those in whose Minds, Hearts and Lives the Truth is predominant against their Errors, as to their Love, choice and practice, are saved, and the contrary perished.

And so I have fully told what I take for the *Catholick Church*.

CHAPTER V.

What is the Catholick Church as described by Bishop Gunning, Dr. Saywell, Mr. Thorndike, Mr. Dodwell, Dr. Sherlock and the French Papists.

§ 1. I Will begin with the *French*, as they differ from the *Italians* and *Spaniards*; those who stand for the *Liberties of the Gallican Church*: For there are now prevalent, the *Jesuits*, who formerly were banished, and many as high as the *Italians*; but these are not the Body of their Nation, and are of late reduction.

Even such as *Pious Gerson*, who was for a Councils power over Popes, yet were wretchedly zealous against the Reformation: Even he was one of the Council at *Constance*, that was for the inhuman and treacherous burning of *John Hus* and *Hierome of Prague*, and the suppression of the *Bohemian* Reformation. And the great Cardinal of *Lorrain*, that was a refuser of the Council of *Trent*, was a persecuting Suppressor of the Protestants.

The judgment of the most moderate *French Papists* (of whom the Statesmen and Lawyers were by far more laudable than the Clergy) I cannot better and brieflier give you, than in the words of the Preface to *Brierwood's Enquiries*, viz. *That the Bishop of Rome was the first and chief Bishop anciently, according to the Dignity of Precedency and Order, not by any Divine Institution; but because Rome was the chief City of the Empire. That he obtained his Primacy over the Western Church, by the Gift and Clemency of Pipin, Charles the Great, and other Kings of France: And hath no Power to dispose of Temporal things: That it belongeth to Christian Kings and Princes to call Ecclesiastical Synods, and to establish their Decrees, to make Ecclesiastical Laws for the good of the Church, reform*

form the Abuses therein, and to have the same Power over sacred persons in causes Ecclesiastical, as was exercised by Jofias & Constantine the Great, who said he was Bishop over the outward things of the Church. That the Laws whereby their Church is to be governed, are only the Canons of the more antient Councils, and their own National Decrees; and not the Decretals of the Bishop of Rome. That the Council of Constance assembled by Sigismund the Emperour, and the concurrent consent of other Christian Princes, decreeing a General Council to be Superior to the Pope, and correcting enormous Abuses in the Roman Church which yet remain in practice, was a true Oecumenical Council, and so likewise the Council at Basil. That the Assembly at Trent was no lawful Council, and the Canons of it rather to be esteemed the Decrees of the Pope, who called and continued it, than the Decrees of the Council: because Bishops only (contrary to the practice of the Council at Basil) had decisive Votes, and the most were Italian, the Popes Vassals; and nothing was determined, that was not at Rome fore-determined by the Pope: That the Sacrament of the Lords Supper ought to be administered in both kinds, and at least a great part of Divine Service to be performed in the vulgar tongue.]

But the higher sort derive the Papacy from *Peter*, and receive the Council of *Trent*, and give decisive Votes to Bishops only, and prevail to continue the Abuses of the Liturgy and Sacraments to this day.

By these Principles it is apparent, that the moderate *Frenchmen* take not the Catholick Church which is under the Pope, to be the Catholick Church of all the world; but the limited Catholick Church of one Empire, by whose power they suppose it stands. These were the Learned Followers of the great and excellent Chancellor of *France*, *Michael Hospitalius*, such as the great *Jac. Thuanns*, and very many more impartial men of rare Learning and universal Love: But the Clergy (being in that Kingdom much left in that point to their private sense) do some of them take all Christians, even of the Sects forementioned, for the Catholick Church: But the higher sort yet confine it to those that are subject to the antient General Councils, of which they acknowledge the Pope to be the ordinary Caller and President. -

§. 2. I. What Archbishop *Bramhall's*, *Grotius's*, Dr. *Peter Heylin's*, Bishop *Sparrow's*, Bishop *Gunning's*, Mr. *Thorndike's*, and

and such others judgment is of the Catholick Church, I shall give you in their own words, whenever I have a just call so to do. In the mean time I shall tell you out of Mr. *Dodwell*, Bishop *Gunning's* Chaplain, Dr. *Saywell*, and this young Dr. *Sherlock*, &c. how they notifie the judgment of their party, which they call *the Church of England*.

§ 3. II. And I have before shewed you, that Mr. *Dodwell* takes the Catholick Church to be not only such Christians as are under one Visible, Supreme Ecclesiastical Power under Christ over all the Church, but also to be confined to those that have a Succession of Diocesans Ordination uninterrupted from the days of the Apostles. But because he knows, that no man on earth can be so skill'd in History, as to be sure of any such uninterrupted Succession, therefore he is forced to acquiesce in a *presumptive Title*. For indeed how should all Bishops and Priests in the world know, that every Bishop was canonically or lawfully Ordained by another Bishop so ordained, to this day?

1. Must it be by History? There is no History extant that giveth us any such Catalogue of Ordainers. I that was ordained by Bishop *Thornborough*, never heard so much as who ordained him, much less how he and all upward were ordained: And many Councils expressly nullifie the Episcopacy of those who are our Ordainers, because chosen by the Magistrates without the consent of the Flock and Clergy.

2. If we must know it by Verbal Tradition, whither shall we go to find the Traditors that will witness this uninterrupted Successive Ordination of every Bishop in the Church; or that will take his Oath of it?

3. If we must know it by Inspiration, or other Revelation, How shall others know that such Episcopal Fanaticks are not deceived?

I undertake to prove, That 1. almost all the Churches on earth have had an interruption of Canonical Diocesan Ordination.

2. That no one on earth can prove that they have such a thing.

3. That the *Church of Rome* hath certainly had many notorious Interruptions. 4. And so hath the *Church of England*, whose derivation is from them. 5. And therefore Mr. *Dodwell's* Catholick Church may be brought into a Nutshell; yea it is none, or

utterly uncertain in the world: and therefore invisible and unintelligible;

ligible; no man being able to prove that there is such a thing on Earth.

And his cement being their subjection to those Councils, which most of these foresaid parties condemn, he shuts out all the said parties; and who they be of his little invisible Catholick Church, and whether the *French*, the *Spaniards*, the *Italians* be any part of it, I despair of sudden knowing: But that the *French* Protestants, and the rest of the Reformed are none of it, and that far most of the Christian world are none, he makes us know.

§ 4. III. Mr. *Thorndike* in one place tells us, That he maketh not Obedience to the particular Canons necessary, but only to the Authority that made them, (for they may alter them) and so to the Canons, till they alter them. And this Authority is One Universal Visible-Governing Church in a General Council, or otherwise notifying their Decrees or Laws.

§ 5. IV. Bishop *Gunning* saith, It is a Colledge of Bishops of all the Churches that are the Supreme Government under Christ of the Visible Universal Church, and our concord lyeth in obeying them, which he that doth not is a Schismatick. But how we shall send to them all over the world, and gather their Votes, and know we have them, &c. I despair of learning: And as much am I to seek, whether yet we have not Church-Laws enough without the further Laws of this Colledge? And how and where their new Laws must be made? Together or asunder? And how it shall be known, which are valid and which not? And in what cases they exercise Judicature? Whether an Heretick, or a perjured person, or an Adulterer, must go to *Abassia*, *Mexico*, *Constantinople*, yea or *Rome*, to be heard and judged, and to all the Bishops in the world? And must take all his Witnesses with him? Or whether, as the Papists when they have told the people, that they must believe the Scripture to be God's word, *because the Catholick-church saith it is so*, and in the upshot mean, *because the Parish-Priest or Bishop saith so*; so it will not here come to that at last, that it is the judgment of the Parish-Priest or Bishop that we must obey, as the judgment of the Colledg?

§ 6. V. His Chaplain Dr. *Saywell* (whom I have reason to take for his Expositor) doth make his Universal Church to be one Governin

verning Power, from which all inferiours must receive Laws: pag. 84. [*I believe the holy Catholick Church*] cannot be truly professed, unless we live in her communion, and pay all Obedience and Subjection to her Laws. — And to this purpose there have been Six General Councils universally owned and received.]

But 1. I have earnestly desired and searcht to know the proof of such a Legislative universal Power, and I cannot find it.

2. I suppose he knoweth that the *Nestorians*, *Jacobites*, *Abasines*, and most of the twelve great Sects of Christians before-mentioned, renounce some of his six Councils: some, that of *Ephesus* 1. and some that of *Calcedon*, &c. And it was a perillous renunciation of that at *Constantinople de tribus capitalis*, that *Italy* it self once made.

3. And how shall any mans Conscience be satisfied by any thing like proof and reason, that just *these six Councils* had a Supreme Legislative Power binding all the Universal Church? And that the second Council at *Ephesus*, the seventh or second at *Nice*, the eighth, the ninth, the tenth, the eleventh, &c. had no such Supreme Power? What! Did the Catholick Church die or cease after the Sixth General Council? Shall we turn Seekers? Or where was it at the time of the seventh, eighth, ninth, &c.? If it was interrupted, we are all unchurched, say these men. How could it be known, or where was it for about a thousand years after? And how shall we ever know when the Authority of Councils revived, or will revive? Were not *Constance*. and *Basil*. Councils your Church? If not, where was it then? and how should all Christians know it and obey it?

It's doleful to think on what accounts all these expect that all Christians Consciences should be satisfied! Yea, on what account they write and talk so fervently for the Magistrate to punish us, as Dr. *Saywell*, and his Lord, and Mr. *Dodwell* himself, with all his humility doth; taking Magistrates for Atheists, or contemners of Religion, that will not punish us. That they dare trust to the Sword, and call for yet more punishment of us, when they give us no better means of conviction, but condemn us as Schismatics, for not being Schismatics that cut off most of the Catholick Church, for not obeying they know not whom or what. Nor can any of them tell us, how to know what or whom. Only we know it must be some Sect of Prelates that cut off the rest, and call themselves the Universal Church, and usurp a power proper

to Christ and the Holy Ghost in the Apostles, to make Laws for all the Church on Earth, and to be the governing judg of all.

But he seems to be of a larger Communion, when pag. 344, 345. he saith, *We are in Charity, and hold Communion with all good Christians (excepting, as above excepted, the fundamental corruptions of the Jesuited part of the Roman and other Churches) throughout the world.*

But 1. The doubt is, whom you will take for *good Christians* in your degree of Charity. 2. And whether the Church of *Rome*, excepting the Jesuited part, be certainly more worthy of your Charity and Communion than the Reformed Churches?

It is evident, that you take none to be in your Communion, 1. Who take not a thing, called *the Universal Church*, to have a Legislative and Judicial supremacy over all Christians. 2. And who profess not subjection to that supremacy and obedience to its Universal Laws. 3. And that must be, at least, to the six first General Councils. Now 1. You know, I suppose, that most of the Christian parties disown some of those Councils, and the power that made them. 2. That most of the Christian world confine their government and obedience to their several Sects, and profess no obedience to the Colledg, or majority of Bishops in the world. The *Greeks* confine their obedience to their party; and the *Armenians* to their Catholick Bishop, and the *Georgians* to theirs, and the *Nestorians* and *Jacobites* to their several pretended Patriarchs, as aforesaid. So that you renounce Communion with these, as no good Christians. 3. And you know, I suppose, that the Protestant Churches of *England* (till your party took that name), of *Scotland*, *Ireland*, *France*, *Belgia*, *Germany*, *Transilvania*, *Hungary*, *Sweden*, *Denmark*, own no such Church at all as you talk of, viz. One supreme universal governing Colledg or Council. Read *Luther de Conciliis*, and it will tell you, how far he was from it. If Mr. *Morrice* will read it, perhaps it may find him more such work as he finds against me.

4. And do you not make your selves Schismatics, in holding Communion with Schismatics? Mr. *Dodwell* and others of you say, that he is a Schismatick who communicateth with Schismatics. The Church of *Rome* (before ever there was a Jesuit

in

in the world, and since) condemn all Christ's Church on Earth, except the Pope and his Subjects; and separate from them. Is not this Schism, and so you Schismatics?

5. And you deny Communion with them that have not Diocesan Ordination by uninterrupted succession: And I suppose you know, that none of the Reformed Churches (except those of the *Babemian* profession, who derive from the *Waldenses*, condemned by General Councils of *Constance* and *Basil*) do pretend to such an uninterrupted Diocesan Ordination. Some have no Diocesans (*French* Protestants, *Belgia*, the *Palatinate*, *Helvetia*, &c.) And those that have some kind of Bishops, had them made by Presbyters, or by no such Succession.

Seeing then, that your Communion is only with the Church of *Rome* (except the Jesuited party) and those of your own mind at home, why do you not speak this out freely, but pretend *Charity* and *Communion with all good Christians*? How prove you, that the Protestant Churches be not as good Christians as the Papists?

6. Yea, I would understand, whether you renounce not Communion with the Church of *England*, and most of the present Conformists, as Schismatics, as well as with the Nonconformists? Consider 1. The Church of *England* owneth not *One Regent supreme power, Monarchical or Aristocratical, for Legislation and Judgment over all Christians on Earth*. Prove that they do it, if you affirm it. Yea, the contrary is plain in the Articles, Canons, the Injunctions, the Apology, and *Jewel's Defence, Deus & Rex*; all approved by the Church. The Church of *England* owneth no *foreign Government over this Kingdom*; yea, *swear-eth the Subjects against it in the Oath of supremacy*, and forbids Appeals to any above the King. The first Canon and second confirm the same: Yea, the very Canons of 1645. *make it the right of all Christian Kings, to call and dissolve Councils in their territories; and that Prelates therefore only first used this, because they had no Christian Kings.* (How then shall General Councils be called out of all the world to rule us)? Yea, they add, *For any persons to set up, maintain or avow, in any their Realms or Territories respectively, under any pretence whatsoever, any independent coercive power, Papal or Popular, is treasonable against God and the King.*

The Articles of Religion say, *Art. 6. Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an Article of the Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation.* But you make it requisite to salvation, to believe all the Oaths, Covenants, Declarations, Professions and Practices imposed on Ministers to be lawful: Else they are Schismaticks, and cannot have communion or salvation.

The 8th *Art.* makes it therefore necessary to receive the three *Creeeds*, because they may be proved by Scripture. And of Councils it saith, *General Councils may not be gathered together without the command and will of Princes.* And will all the Princes in the world ever agree to gather one, or did they ever do it)? And when they be gathered together (forasmuch as they be an Assembly of men, whereof all be not governed of the Spirit and word of God) they may err, and sometime have erred, even in things pertaining to God. Wherefore things ordained by them, as necessary to salvation, have neither strength nor authority, unless it may be declared that they are taken out of holy Scripture.

And of the Church, *Art. 19.* it gives us this only definition, *The visible Church of Christ is a Congregation of faithful men, in which the pure word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be duly administered, according to Christs ordinance in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same.* Is an essential governing supremacy left out in a definition?

The 36th *Art.* saith, That the book of Consecration containeth all things necessary thereto—and whoever is consecrated or ordered according to the rites of the book, are rightly, lawfully and orderly consecrated. But that book saith nothing for the necessity of an uninterrupted succession of Diocesan Ordination.

And *Art. 23.* saith, that those we ought to judge lawfully called and sent, which be chosen and called to this work by men who have publick authority given them in the Congregation, to call and send Ministers into the Lords Vineyard.

Saith Compton to King James in *Pref. to Consens Tables*, *Ecclesiastica jurisdictio plane Regia est; Corona & dignitatis vestra Regia prima, precipua, indivisibilis pars: Ecclesiastice Leges Regia sunt; neq; alibi oriuntur, aut aliunde sustentantur aut fulciuntur.*

nam. Penes Ecclesiasticos Judicis per Archiepiscopos & Episcopos derivata a Rege potestate. Jurisdictio Ecclesiastica consistit. But

1. You set up a foreign power, as supreme, above the King.
2. And you utterly disable King, or Bishop, or Convocation from choosing a Bishop or Priest that shall have any power; For, by you, neither King, nor Patron, nor Clergy, nor People, can call any man with power to the ministerial work, that hath not an uninterrupted succession of Diocesan Ordination: Which no King, Bishop or People can know; but in most places may know the contrary. Say not, that I accuse you of treasonable destroying all the Kings Ecclesiastical power, by this *subjecting* and *disabling* him. It is not my words, but your defenders, that I give you.

Mr. Lobb hath said so much of Mr. Hooker's and Dr. Field's, that I shall not recite any thing of theirs. That which I now note is, that you judge the true former Church of England Schismatics, and separate from them, as none of your Communion, because they believed not any such thing as a supreme humane Governor, Monarchical or Aristocratical, under Christ, of the whole Church on Earth. If any yet doubt of this sense of the Church of England in the days of Archbishop *Abbot*, Archbishop *Grindal*, and so to the first Reformation, let them read the Writings of *Jewel*, *Reignolds*, *VVotton*, *VVhitaker*, *Hall*, *Crakenthorpe*, *Slater*, *Willet*, *Humfrey*, *Sutcliffe*, *Bilson*, *Chillingworth*, and other such.

How narrow a Society then is your *Catholic Church*, and how great *Schismatics* are you, if you separate both from all the Christian world, who own no visible supreme *Legislative* or *Executive* power under Christ, and from all the Reformed Churches, and even from the Church of England it self, except your own faction, and can condemn *Hen. 8—Edw. 6.* as much as *Heylin* doth.

If you go to Mr. *Dodwell's* *Presumption of right and succession*, and that *God is bound to own that*; You will harden all those that you would convince, and do condemn; If men be true Ministers, a true Church, have true Sacraments and Covenant-right to salvation, when those Ministers have no Orders but counterfeit, or the Bishops that Ordained them had none at all, or no such succession, so be it the Receiver be blameless, and could not know it: then sure they that thought a Bishop and Pres-

byter had been all one, or that, as Dr. *Hammond* held, Bishops in Scripture-times had but single Churches or Congregations; and that the chief Pastor of a City or Church, is a Bishop; and that the Ordination of such an Assembly as that at *Westminster*, &c. is valid, and do their best to know the truth, are as blameless in their Error as the other.

I have elsewhere named seven or eight drunken Readers, that I was bred under, and some that were at last discovered to have forged Orders; the people constantly communicated with all these: On the other hand, I have lived with many zealous, godly, charitable, excellent Preachers, who were presented by the Patrons, chosen or desired by the people, Ordained by many Learned, Godly Pastors, of whom divers were Doctors of Divinity, and City-Pastors, ordained by Bishops, and they had the sealed Approbation of the *Westminster*-Assembly, (to which the Parliament called many Bishops, though they came not :) which of these were like to be more excusable, if they erred? And which had the better presumptive Title? And why then is an uninterrupted Succession falsely feigned to be necessary, even to men that are zealous for Episcopacy, and Ordained by Bishops?

7. And I hope you are willing that we should understand, that by *Communion* you mean a communion of subjection to the Supreme Church-power, and that the Church of *Rome* are all subjected to the Pope: And if you have communion with all of them, *save the Jesuited party*, and yet none with us or any other Reformed Protestant Churches, who renounce that sort of Communion, I beseech you satisfy the world, Why you are any less Papists than the Church of *Rome* is? I suppose you know, that Jesuits have never been Popes, and that very few of them, if any, are Cardinals. (But I must note, that it is but their corruptions that you renounce.)

And Dr. *Wm. Bishop Sparrow* in his Preface before his *Collection of Canons*, doth not only assert the Legislative Power of a National Church, but of the Universal, as one Body or Church.

And Dr. *John Child* Dr. *Shook* (if he be Dr. *Stillingfleet's* Defender) saith and unsaith, and would verifie contradictions. He must write us a new Dictionary, to tell us in what sense he takes common words, before he can be understood: He defendeth Dr.

Stilling-

Brilliant denies of any Political constitutive Supreme Power, and yet maintaineth that the whole Church hath one Regent part, which all must obey that will be Members.

But he will not grant, That every Political Body must have a constitutive Regent Head: And yet he doth but say, [*If we deny this*] as if he could not or durst not tell what he grants or denies. Yet he grants, that [*Every Political Body consists of a pars imperans and subdita:*] And that [*Church-Governours united and governing by consent, are the pars imperans, and Christian people the pars subdita.*] But saith he [*All this is true without a constitutive Regent Head.*] Can you tell how his asserted and his denied Propositions differ? 1. It is not a Regent Part that he denieth. 2. It is not that this Regent part is one to the whole Body, the Church. For if it were that, he would not so zealously contradict and condemn us, that say the same as he: Nor call it Singularly the Pars imperans to the Universal Church. What should an ordinary Reader conjecture of this man? As *Cesar* said of a young man, that was so earnest in his Petition, that he gaped and stammered, and could scarce speak, *Nescio quid vult hic juvenis, sed quicquid vult vehementer vult.* So I only understand that this man is an Adversary to such as I, and would fain have us accounted intollerable Schismatics; but what his more excellent knowledg herein is, that deserveth preferment, while we deserve Silencing and a Jail, it must be a *Daniel*, and not an ordinary Interpreter of words that must make known.

It must be either the word [*Head*], or the word [*constitutive*] which he denieth.

1. If it be the word [*Head*] of a Political Body, 1. Either he knows that Politicks commonly take it for Synonimal with *Summa Potestas*, and the *Pars Regens* in chiefe, or he doth not. If he do not, why would he meddle (and so flamingly meddle) with what he understands not, and in his confident Ignorance blow up the common fire of hatred, contention and prosecution? If he know it, his business is to shew himself so much wiser than the Writers of Politicks, as to prove we should be ruined for understanding words as they do, even this word *Head*? And yet the man never tells us how he understands it, as differing from them!

But 2. this yet will not excuse him: Either he knows that King *Edward* the Sixth, and Queen *Elizabeth*, after King *Henry* the Eighth, used the word *Head* for the *Summa Potestas*, or not;

If not, he is a great stranger in *England*: The Title of *King Edward's Injunctions*, the first in *Bishop Sparrow* is, [*Injunctions given by—Edw. 6.—on earth under Christ, of the Church of England and Ireland the Supreme Head*; which *Queen Elizabeth* and the *Canons* expound, *Supreme Governour*.] But if he know this, doth he allow it in them, or not?

3. Yet further, Doth this burning-hot Disputant know, or not, that I use the word *Pars Imperans*; or least that should be mistaken for coactive Power, *Pars regens*, far oftner than the word *Head*; yea ever expound the word *Head* by it, and seldom use the word *Head* at all? If he know not this, let who will honour him for speaking evil (and so evil) of the things he knows not: If he know it and dissimble it, —name him as you see cause.

§ 10-11. But if it be not the word [*Head*] that he would not have a *General Council*, a *Primate*, or *Metropolitan* called by, there is nothing but the word [*Constitutive*] left for him to deny. This then must be it.

And 1. I dare not teach him like a School-boy, but only tell the unlearned Reader, that a *Constitutive Cause* in the common sense of Logicians, signifieth the *Essentiating Cause* as distinct from the *Efficient* and *Final*, that is, it signifieth the *Essentiating Matter* and *Form*: A Political Society either hath *Matter* and *Form*, or not. If yea, what is the *Form*, if not the *Regent part* in relation to the body? Its *species* is the *specifying Form*, *quæ dædiffe ut nomen*: And in existence it is the *Unifying or Individuating Form*. But if it have no *Form*, it is *nothing*, and hath no name,

1. If the *Summa Potestas* of the Church be not the constitutive *Form*, then the Church is not a Society univocally so called, as all other Political Societies are; but is equivocally called a *Polis*: A King, a Master of a Family, a Schoolmaster, a General or chief Commander, are all Constitutive parts.

2. Then a Bishop is no constitutive part of a Diocesan Church, nor a Metropolitan of a Metropolitan Church, nor a Patriarch of a Patriarchal Church, nor any *Summa Potestas* of any Church; or else the Catholics and these are not univocally called Churches.

3. If the *Summa Potestas* be not a Constitutive part of the Church Catholic, it is no Essential part: And if so, the Church must be defined without it. And why do they not give such a Definition, and tell us what is the constitutive Form of it, if this be not?

4. And

4. And then he that denieth this *Summa Potestas*, and separateth^H from it, denieth or separateth from nothing essential to the Church; Why then do they make obedience essential to a Member?

I must intreat Lawyers; and men acquainted with the common terms of Laws and Politicks, to pity us, and not make us Clergy-Disputants a common scorn for such Disputes, as they might do, if they heard us furiously disputing, whether a King be the constitutive Head of the Kingdom? Or whether twice two be four?

§. 11. But saith this Doctor, *Its original Constitution differs from Secular Forms of Government, by that ancient Church-canon of our Saviours own decreeing, It shall not be so among you.*

Ans. There's some hope in this citation. It seems then, he thinks that by these words, Christ forbade any *constitutive supremacy under him in his Church*; why then doth the man so fiercely dispute for it? If there be none, we are agreed. And alas! young Dr. ! why must we all be silenced, or lie in Goal for agreeing with you?

If he should mean, that Christ speaketh only against a Policy that hath the power of the Sword, he would be an immodest deceiver by intimating, that this is the Policy in question: I will therefore rather conclude, that if he know what he saith, I am incapable of knowing, rather than impute this to him; or else that he takes it to be no Policy that hath not the power of the Sword.

§. 12. But his satisfying answer is, p. 565. *Governing by consent without superiority, is Government.*

Ans. Who would think these men were for things *ancient or common*, that talk in a new singular language of their own at such a rate? 1. What is the meaning of *Governing without superiority*, as put in opposition to *One constitutive supremacy*? Is it *governing without superiority over the pars subdita*? It is to really, whatever he mean. We have hit of the matter: It is governing *sine jure regendi*. But then I hope we break not the 5th Commandment by disobeying them.

But I rather think the Dr. meant *without superiority over one another*.

Ans. And verily doth the Church of England think, that an *Aristocracy is no constitutive head*, or *summa potestas*, or form of

of policy? Had the Senators at *Rome* power over one another, as such? Or hath the *Venetian* Senate? or the *Polonian* Parliament men? Doth this novelty and singularity deserve no word of proof, but *ipse dixit*? See how all Politicks are damn'd with the Nonconformists, for making Aristocracy a *species* of Policy? But I pray you use them not all for it as hardly as you do us. But really thus much of the world is governed.

Q. 13. 3. But yet his stress may possibly lie on the word [*Consent*]. *It is not a constitutive supremacy, but a supremacy by consent.*

Ans. Far be it from me to pretend to so much Learning as to understand him. If this be the difference, I Cannot *Consent* make a supreme constitutive power. See here Mr. *Dodwell*, how you were mistaken, and Dr. *Stillingfleet* too, that say so much for *consent*, as *Causal* to this effect. I thought all Government in the world had been by consent, except as to the *Genus* (that there be a Government). and so much of the *species* as God hath determined by his Universal Laws: But as to the *rest*, and the *family* or *persons*, I supposed it's all by consent. Sure the King is not King without his consent, and the people consented when they chose his family, and swear Allegiance to him. Sure General and Soldiers *consent*; Husband and Wife; Master and Servants; School-Master and Scholars: And I think the States of *Belgia*, the Parliament of *Poland*, the Senate of *Venice* and *Rome*, had all a constitutive power by *consent*.

Readers, you see all that I can bring this Dr's damning differencing accusation of us to. He granteth, that the *Catholick Church* (and the *National*) is a *Political society or body*, consisting of a governing and governed part; but he denieth, that this governing part is a constitutive part, or *supreme*; but saith, it is, a *pari passu*, governing by consent without superiority. I think he means it is not a *Monarchy*, but an *Aristocracy* (and govern not against their wills): Ergo they are not a *constitutive* (that is, an *essential* and *unifying* supreme part. Alas! that the Church must have such work, and that to our common shame, and to the utter frustration of all hopes and endeavours of brotherly peace with the sacred Clergy!

CHAP. VI.

What is the Union of the Catholick Church, and the necessary Communion, according to this accusing Defender.

§. 1. **W**Hen we have found out (were we so happy) what their Catholick Church is; we are yet to seek, how any man may know that he is a member of it, or who is. For to that end, we must first know, 1. What Union of and with the Church is. 2. And who are qualified for it, and have it: And such dullards as I, can learn none of this of these Drs.

§. 2. 1. This Dr. takes it for granted, that *Union* here, is *nothing but Communion*. Still we are intolerable Schismatics, for not differing from Christians and Mankind. But he maketh us know, that it is a Political Union which he speaketh of. Dr. Barrow hath told him of seven sorts of Union acknowledged by us all, who deny with him a Political Unity in one humane supreme Aristocracy. But this singular man must have a Political unifying supreme power, which is no Constitutive Head: that is, *it is* and *is not* the *summa potestas humana, visibilis*. Of this more fully elsewhere.

Raymundus Lullius, Paracelsus, Jacob Behmen, and all such Fanaticks, who have thought fit (like Gypsies) to invent new words, to make themselves seem Masters of a new *Pansophie*, have yet left us some clue to guide us through their labyrinth; and their own Context is their Dictionary. But this Dr. who will use old words in his new and contrary sense, and tell us no reason for them, becometh to us unintelligible. Hitherto all Political Union hath been supposed to be antecedent to *Communion*. And if the sound of the *Latin* word seem to countenance the confounder, *κοινωνία* doth not so. And he shews, that by *Communion* he meaneth what the Church hath usually meant by it when it's taken for a Political Communion; that is, joyning in the exercises named by him under Ecclesiastical Governours.

But

But 1. This is contrary to the common course of *Nature*, in which the union of all *compound beings* maketh them what they are, and goeth before their Operation and Effects: The Union of Soul and Body goeth before Sensation, Imagination, Intellection, or Volition.

2. It is contrary to all *Artificial* beings: In a clock, a watch, a coach, &c. the Union of their parts is the Relative Form, and goeth before the exercise, and use, and the effects.

3. It is contrary to all *Political* beings, or Societies: The Union of King and Subjects is the constitutive Form of the Kingdom, and goeth before the Administration or regiment, by Legislation and Judgment; and the Allegiance, or Subjection, before Obedience.

The Union of Husband and Wife goeth before their Conjugal communion: And so doeth the union of Master and Servants, of Captain and Soldiers, of Schoolmaster and Scholars, as the constitution of the relation go before their communion in the exercise of relation. Now if this Doctor be of his Brother *Dodwell's* mind, and think *all words have but one sense*, which men skill'd in Arts and Sciences should know, judge whether he practice according to that Supposition.

4. If *Union* and *Communion* be all one, then a man is new made a Christian at every act of Communion: For *Union* is the constitution, and makes us Christians: But the consequence is not true.

5. If *Union* and *Communion* be all one, then Baptism doth no more make us Christians and unire us to Christ and his Church, than after communion in Prayer and Sacraments do: But this is singular and false.

This accusing Dr. then grounds his Accusation on such Dissents of ours from his Judgment, in which we speak with all Christians and Mankind, (as to their common sense of words) and deserve to be accounted Schismatics and criminals, for not saying, as he, against them all: As if he would commence an Action against all *Grammarians* that will not say, *That Letters are nothing but Words and Sentences*, and cast out all School-Masters that deny it. But let us see what his Communion is which constituteth the Churches Unity.

§ 2. To prepare his way, he saith, *That I make the Unity of this Church to consist only in their union to Christ as Head of the Church, not in the union of Churches as Members of the same Body.* Answ. I must

must take heed how I deny any thing that he saith, lest he presently say, *I give him the lie, or rail.* But I may answer his next request, (pag. 595.) *I would desire Mr. B. and his Brethren, to tell us, How the whole Catholick Church is united into one Body? I assert this is done by one Communion: If he can tell any better way, I would gladly learn it, &c.* *Ans.* This is a sudden humiliation. But did he not before desire me to *give over stating Cases?* And yet now he would learn of me! If so, I must desire him first preparatorily to learn of some Grammarians, Metaphysical and Political Teachers, What the meaning of *Union* and *Communion* is? What is the difference between *Essentials*, and *Integrals* and *Accidents*; and of *Union* and *Communion* in each of these? And how many sorts of *Union* and *Communion* there are, that are pertinent to our case? And whether a *Supreme Aristocracy* be not constitutive to the governed *Society*? Many of these things you must learn of some body else, before I dare presume to teach you. But I'll tell you, 1. That I cannot talk sense about these things, without distinguishing between the *Unifying* of the *Society*, and the uniting a single Member to that *Society*. 2. An *Essentiating Union*, and an *Integrating* or *Accidental Union* and *Communion*.

And so my account which you demand is this. 1. It is only essential to the Church, *That there be an Organized Body of Pastors and People united to Christ the Head.* I put in the most: For this much was not needful to the Church at first; when there was none but Christ and his first Disciples, not yet Pastors: but the Church was then an *Embrio in fieri*: This is the most *in facto esse*: not meddling with the Question, Whether if all Pastors ceased, it would be annihilated, or only unfit for its acts of communion.

2. In this Definition, *Christ only is the formal constitutive summa Potestas, or Regent part*; the *Organized body* of Pastors and people is but the *Partes subdita*; and the *Union* of Christ and that Body maketh it a Church.

As in the constitution of Man; 1. The Rational Soul is the *real Form*, which is *principium motus*. 2. The Organized Body is the constitutive Matter: That there be Heart, Liver and Stomack, is but the Bodies Organization: That these parts be duly placed and united, is *forma corporis non hominis*, and makes the Body but *materia disposita*. 3. The *Union* of Soul and Body is that *nexus* (like the *Copula* in a Proposition) which may be called the *Relative Form*, or that which maketh the Soul become *Forma in actu*.

3. In this Union there is no *Summa Potestas*, or Universal Government (Monarchical or Aristocratical) but Christ: All subordinate Governours have a local, limited Power, every one in his Province, limited by *natural* Capacity, and by Obligation and Office. As there is no need of a Vice-King to make this a Kingdom, nor a subordinate Soul to make a man; So P. Gregory well concludeth, That an Usurper of Universal Episcopacy is Antichrist. And an Aristocracy is more incapable than a Monarch.

4. The Body is sufficiently organized, if it consists of local Churches, called single or particular, being Pastors and Christian people (having all the Essentials of Christianity:) As this Kingdom is, if the Body consist of Corporations, Counties, Hundreds, that have no Power over one another, nor any universal Power, but the Supreme. And that which maketh this Body to become a Church, is no Union of the Members among themselves (that maketh them but *materia disposita*;) but their common Union with Christ; and then all single persons and Churches are one *Catholic Church*, because united in and to him: As all Lines are united in the Center.

5. As to the Question, Whether a single Church, or the Catholic Church be first? Christ was first himself, and then Christians as Christians were united to him; and were the Catholic Church *in fieri* or an Embryo: And then the Pastors Office was made as the organical Office to make the rest; As Nature maketh the Heart and other noble organical parts, before the rest of the Body. And when the particular Churches are formed, they are thereby parts of the Universal, and as such are *simul & semel*, such Churches, and such parts.

6. There is no Christian, nor any single Church or Nation, nor the major part of them, an essential part of the *Catholic Church*, but merely an *Integral*. If England Apostatize, if all Europe Apostatize, or turn Hereticks, or any way be cut off from Christ, the *Catholic Church* loseth but Integral parts, and no Essentials. If there were none but Christ and this Nation, it would be essentially the same *Catholic Church*: Much more if such a Council as *Arminium*, *Sirminum*, yea or any of the rest had fallen from Christ. If a Hand, or Foot, or Leg be cut off, the man is still a man: If the Soul and Body be separated; he is no Man: If the Head, or Heart, or Stomack, or Lungs, or Liver be gone, the Soul will be

be gone, because the Body is not organically capable Matter. But in Politicks, the subordinate parts are not tyed together by so unchangeable a contexture as in natural Bodies. If all the Corporations in *England* were put down, it would be a Kingdom still *ejusdem speciei*: If the Justices and Constables, yea and Judges were all changed as to their subordinate *Species* of Magistracy, the Kingdom in *specie* would be the same. But if the *Supreme Power* be changed in *specie*, *vel individuis*, the Kingdom is changed accordingly. If you object, That a Parliament is an universal Power; I answer, Either they have part in the Supremacy, (that is, in *Legislation* and *Judicature*) or not? If yea; then still there is but one *Summa Potestas* mixt: If not, their utter destruction would not alter the *Species* of the Government.

7. That a single person be united as a Member to the Church, no more is necessary *ad esse*, but that he be a Christian baptized, and so he is united to Christ the centre, and consequently to that Church, which is nothing but all *Christians* united to *Christ*, and in him related as Members of one Body. External Baptism maketh a visible Member of Christ and the Church; which supposeth a Profession of Christian Faith; Desire and Subjection. Internal sincere Heart-consent maketh a Spiritual Member of the Church as invisible. This which is necessary *ad esse* to a single persons Union with the Body, is necessary to every one of the material, subject part of the Church, and must be in some *ad esse Ecclesie*, because without apt receptive matter the Form is not received: But all this Person, or Nation, or greatest part of the Church, is but an Integral, which may be cut off without the Churches cessation.

8. By all this it is evident what I think, 1. That Communion in Essentials, that is in Christianity, is after Union necessary to continue and prove the Church to be one true Church, and to prove any man a Member of it. 2. That Communion in Integrals is necessary to the Integrity of the Church, that is, to not as the Pope and Mr. Dodwell, and his like, Schismatically cut off others, yea most of the Christian world. 3. That communion in Accidents is necessary neither to the Essence nor Integrity; but like hair and nails. Natural accidents should be alike in all. But I hope all that unceremonious Pelwings are not cut off and damned; though I have the Apostles fear, that Satan beguileth multitudes as he did Eve, by drawing them to depart from the firm.

plicity that is in Christ. And every Humanist that useth artificial teeth, and eyes, and paint, and hair, and gawdy fashions, is not thereby unchristened, unchurched, or unman'd.

§ 3. Now let us learn of Mr. *Sherlock*, seeing he is so humble as to learn of us. He saith, p. 595. *I shall not insist here on Catholick Doctrine, or Catholick Charity, which are necessarily supposed as the foundations of Catholick Communion; but yet are not sufficient to make the Church one, when they do not unite all in one Communion.*

Ans. 1. If such Doctrine be supposed, is he a Catholic that hath your fore-described Doctrine against God the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, and that writeth as malignantly as you have done, to urge men to hate, and silence, and imprison those that will not be as bad as you?

Ans. 2. Is Catholick Doctrine and Catholick Charity insufficient to make the Church one? Surely you take Catholick Doctrine to include our belief of the Holy Catholick Church, and the Communion of Saints: And Catholick Church to include our love to the Holy Catholick Church and Communion of Saints.

1. That which is enough to make a Christian, is enough to make a Member of the Catholick Church; For every Christian is such a Member, (He that is a Member of Christ, is a Member of his body the Catholick Church). But Baptism is enough to make a Christian or Member of Christ (*viz.* as oral consent and Baptism visibly, heart consent mystically): Ergo, such Baptism is enough to make a Member of the Catholick Church.

2. They that have the sanctifying Spirit of Christ, are Members of the Body of Christ: But he that hath true Faith and Love, or Catholick Doctrine and Catholick Charity, hath the sanctifying Spirit of Christ. This is not enough *ad bene esse*, but its enough to the being of a Christian and Church-Member. And that which maketh all Christians one in Christ, maketh the Church one; and if they have Pastors in their several Provinces, they are one organized ordered Church.

§ 4. But (saith he) *Catholick Communion, strictly so called, principally consists in two things; 1. In the agreement and concord of the Bishops of the Catholick Church among themselves and with each other.*

Ans. I know not well how Agreement and concord differ, nor
[among

[among themselves, and with one another.] But I know that there are divers terms and degrees of *Concord*: To repeat what is said, There is Agreement in Essentials, Integrals and Accidents: Doth this man dream that no Bishops are Christians and Catholicks, that have any disagreement? that is, no two in the world? If he think not so, what doth he take his Reader to be, who will take communion and union for all one, and then will take up with the name of communion in general, without ever hearing in what that communion must consist, and in what degree?

2. And is communion of Bishops only necessary to Church-unity? why not of Presbyters also?

3. Who doubts but there must be communion? But the Question is, Whether it must be in or under an Aristocratical Sovereign? He adds,

§. 5. 2. *In the communion of particular Churches and Christians with one another.*

Ans. 1. This is after Union. 2. The Question is, What communion this must be?

§ 6. Saith he, [*All the Bishops in the world are Collegues.*]

Ans. So far as the Church is a Colledge: And so are all Presbyters and Christians Collegues.

Sher. *No man can have the honour of a Bishop, who doth not live in Unity with his Fellow-Bishops.*

Ans. But what Unity? No one that liveth not in a Union in the Essentials of Christianity and Ministry? But *Chrysostome* and *Theophilus Alex.* and *Epiphanius*, might all be Bishops, though they had much Discord, and condemned one another: And so might *Cyril*, and *Memnon*, and *Johann. Antioch.* and *Theodoret*, and the Orthodox, and the *Novatians*, and the Eastern and Western Bishops since; and the old and the new sort of *Englisch* Bishops, if they differ not tota specie.

2. And Unity in Essentials is needful with Presbyters and people, as well as with Bishops.

Sher. *That the Catholick church is one, when it is not rent and divided, &c.*

Ans. True, when it is not rent or divided from Christ, or any Essential of Christianity: But the most of the Christian world excommunicate, curse or separate from each other, as supposed unfound

unsound and usurpers at this day. Else, alas, what a case are those of you in, who smite the Shepherds, and scatter the flocks; and do not only divide, but persecute and separate from, and unchurch most of the Christians upon Earth?

§ 7. Sher. *And hence it is evident, That a superior Power over Bishops, is not necessary to the Unity of the church.*

Ans. All unintelligible! Do you mean over the *species* of Bishops, or over the *Individual* Bishops? 1. In any Aristocracy, there is no power of man above the persons that constitute it in *specie*. The *Roman* and *Venetian* Senators are equals: but the Senate hath power over every Individual. But why did you never prove what we deny, that there is any such supreme Senate? 2. And the Pope is but a Bishop claiming the Supreme seat, 3. And why then do Bishops swear Obedience to Archbishops, if Archbishops have no superior Power over them?

§ 8. Sher. *This communion among Bishops was expressed, 1. By writing and receiving Letters about church-affairs.*

Ans. So do the Independents and Presbyterians. Do none do this but a Sovereign Senate? 2. Is this the Communion that unifieth the Church? I hope it is a Church, and men are Members of it, before they write Letters.

§ 9. Sher. 2. *By advising together about the publick affairs of the Church, and communicating counsels with each other, and giving a reason of their actions, &c.*

Ans. 1. This Independents and all good Christians are ready to do. 2. How doth this differ from the former? Do you not mean advising by Letters or Messengers? If not, Is it General Councils that you mean, or what? How is it that we must advise with them of *Armenia*, *Abassie*, and the rest? Did not *Claudian* the *Abassian* Emperour stall *Oviedo* or the other Missionaries, when he asked him, If Subjection to the Pope be so necessary, Why they never heard from him till now? And made them confess the Popes natural incapacity, the distance was so great, and the way precluded: And so we may say of a General Senate. 3. But how? Is it only *Publick Affairs* that the College adviseth you about? Who is it then that must dispose of the Church, State and Souls of all us Individuals? It seems it is some body below the Senate that is meant,

meant, when we are told that we must obey the Universal Church? I thought whither it must come at last.

Here he instances in many *Letters* written as a distinct way from *writing Letters*, which was the first.

He tells us, [*Provincial Councils sent their Decrees to be confirmed by universal consent, which did serve the ends of Catholick communion better than any General Councils did.*]

Ans. 1. Really! did they send Messengers with their Provincial Canons all over the world, and receive their approbation? Was the Consent Universal, or by Major Vote? And who gathered the Votes? And where are they recorded? Have your Canons of late silencing and excommunicating Church-Laws, which you call for our Obedience to, been sent to, and approved by all the Christian world? Where are the Testimonies or Records of their approbation? Was *France, Spain, Italy* sent to? Were the *Greeks, Armenians, Abassines, Georgians* sent to? Have all the Protestant Churches whom you unchurch, approved them? How shall we know all this to be true? Or are you Schismatics for doing what you have done without the consent of the Universal Church?

2. But did you think men may not be obliged to the fullest consent and concord attainable, without being subject to an universal Aristocracy?

§ 10. He next confuteth Dr. *Isaac Barrow*; but he had dealt more exactly, if he had never named his Book: For upon my knowledge it hath tempted some to look into it, that had never read it, and there all the cause of the *Universal Senators* is exposed to shame, and trodden in the dirt. I heartily thank Dr. *Tillotson* for publishing, and open owning it, and shewing his dissent from the Universal Supremacy.

He saith, Dr. *Barrow*, p. 30. (he thinks) hath not made a true representation of it, when he saies, that the case of the Bishops was like to that of Princes, each of whom hath a free Superintendency in his own Territory; but to uphold Justice and Peace in the world, or between adjacent Nations, the intercourse of several Princes is needful.

Well Sir, And what have you against this? Why, 'This makes Christian communion as arbitrary a thing as the confederacy of Princes.'

Ans. Reader, This sort of men hate distinction; but I cannot be

be in that a Conformist to them. Christian communion in the *Essentials* is equally necessary to *Christian Bishops* and *Christian Kings*: And the same I say of the *Integrals*. Doth this man think that all Readers are such Sots, as to acquiesce in the cheat of the general name of *Christian communion*? Are Christian Princes no Christians? Are they not as much as Bishops under the general obligation, to do all things in Love, and promote the concord and peace of Christians? This is not arbitrary, that is, left to their refusing choice: But the time and other circumstances are left much to the prudence of Kings, as they are to Bishops.

But, saith this Doctor, [*The Episcopal Office is but one, and therefore ought to be administered by the mutual advice and consent of Bishops, who all equally share in it.*]

Ans. I doubt if I do but distinguish the *Species* and the *Individuum*, these new Doctors are so far above me in Academical Learning, that they will but scorn it. But I must venture. The Episcopal Office in *specie* is but one. And I am such an Heretick as to think the same of Monarchy (though there may be gradual and accidental differences) yea of Fathers, Husbands, Masters of Families, Schoolmasters: The Office is one in *specie*. Is it one as individuate by the subject? Sure *Chrysostome*, and *Theophilus*, and *Epiphanius*, *Bonner*, *Gardiner*, and *Cranmer* and *Ridley*, were not one man? But perhaps you think that as *Averrhois* thought all Souls are one, individuate only by receptive matter; so all Bishops are one, and individuate only subjectively. But if it were proved that Spirits are like Light, which in an hundred Glasses sheweth an hundred Faces; yet Episcopacy being a Relation, a *Fun* and *Obligation*, methinks is not capable of being one in many thousand various subjects, save only by an union in *specie*. But, Reader, I am no University Scholar, and must not be too peremptory against the elevated Doctors of this Church, the most Learned and excellent, if you will believe themselves, that are in all the world.

But it is *Cyprians* words, that *Episcopatus unus est*; some sence that holy Martyr meant by those words: No doubt of it. In *specie* the Office is one: Though such as Mr. *Dodwell* would perswade men, that we have just so much power and work as the ordaining Bishops intended to give us; yet Christ is Christ, whether these men will or not, and hath described the Pastoral Office which no man hath power to alter, and it is the same in all the world. And it is one therefore, in that it is one sort of work which they have all to do:

do. And one Church Catholick whose publick good they are all to promote, and one end to attain.

And the difference between men whose power is founded in personal sufficiency, and others, must be still observed. *E.g.* A man licensed in general to be a Physician, a Schoolmaster, &c. is hereby related *indefinitely* to all the world; because he may set up any where, when called; and may practise occasionally where he comes. But as he is related specially to an Hospital, to a School, as their peculiar Physician, Schoolmaster, &c. so he is not related to all the world. And therefore Bishops are so oft condemned by the Canons, that play the Bishops in other mens Dioceses (as *St. Epiphanius* did in *St. Chrysostomes*.)

And thus indeed a King is not so much related to all the world, nor the General of an Army, as a Christian Minister, a Physician, or a Philosopher is. For the Offices and Power of these is but for the exercise of their personal qualifications (as they will find one day to their cost, who have learned to do their Episcopal works *per alios*, and as the Lord Bacon in his *Considerations* hath clearly opened): But the very *place* of a King (like the first figure in numbers) is of great signification without his personal abilities, and more of the Government may be committed to Officers, than by a Bishop in Church-Government, or a Philosopher, or Physician, or Schoolmaster, can be done. A man may be first a Licensed Physician, Schoolmaster, or Preacher in general, and after fixed to some company, (and in the fixed sense no man is a Bishop out of his Diocese, much less to all the world: But in the first case he is in an aptitude to be employed or fixed any where in the world). But a King or a General is not first for his personal Abilities ordained in general to the Office, as an aptitude preparatory to his fixing; though personal aptitude is exceeding desirable *ad bene esse*. And now judge, whether *Episcopatus unus est*, do make a *Sovereign Aristocracy*, as *una persona politica* by a major Vote to govern all the Church.

§ 11. He adds, [*And Catholick Communion is essential to the Unity of the Church: And he who violates it by an unreasonable dissent, whatever he be, is a Schismatick, and therefore no Member of the Catholick Church.*]

Ans. Almost as many Fallacies or Errours, as words. 1. What Communion is essential to Unity? Is it Communion in one form

of Liturgy? Or in the same Ceremonies? Or the same mutable Church-Offices? Or the same Oaths, Covenants, Declarations, Subscriptions, which are imposed on pain of Silencing in *England*? Communion in the same Spirit, Faith, Hope, Love, and reception of all the essentials of Christianity, is needful to our continued Unity; but so is not our communion in mere Integrals and Accidents.

Ans. 2. Communion in the usual sense is not essential to Unity, but its necessary consequent, no more than *operatio* is essential *ad esse*, which ever goeth before it.

Ans. 3. That which is essential to your Union with the Church, is not essential to the Church: You and all *Europe* may Apostatize, and the essence of the Catholick Church not be altered.

Ans. 4. Every man that erreth in any thing, so far violateth Communion by an *unreasonable Dissent*: So did either *Chrysostome*, or *Epiphanius* and *Theophilus*; either *Cyril* or *Joan. Ant.* and *Theodore*; either *Martin*, or the Synods of Bishops that he separated from; either the Bishops of *Rome*, or the *Italians* that cast him off, and set up a Patriarch at *Aquileia*; either the *Roman* or the *Greek* Church long: In a word, the twelve fore-mentioned great Parties of Christians that now make up the Christian world (which to me is the Catholick Church) do dissent and partly separate from each other: And every erroneous dissent is unreasonable. But many that separate from local Communion, and rashly judge others, separate not from Faith, Love, or any Essential of Christianity, and therefore not from Christ nor his Body.

Ans. 5. A Schismatick that separates from Christ, or the Universal Church, is no Member of it; but millions are Members of it, that are guilty of sinful Divisions in the Church, and Schism from particular Churches.

Ans. 6. Ex ore tuo: As by this general charge of Schism you cut off almost all the Christian world, so your self and such as you notoriously. Do not these violate Catholick communion, who *ipso facto* excommunicate all that your Canons so Excommunicate, and that Silence thousands of Ministers, and plead for their being laid in Jayls with Rogues, for not doing such things as ours, which the Catholick Church never owned or agreed in? Do you believe the Christian Verity and the Life to come, and yet think that God will not judge them guilty of Church-dividing that do all

all this? And that reproaching his Servants will excuse you from the Guilt?

§ 12. Saith he, [*The Christian Church is governed by the Episcopal Colledge, wherein every Bishop hath equal Power.*]

Ans. 1. This is your fundamental Errour, if it be not a down-right Heresie; and you and the Papists Hereticks by it; we must have a narrower Definition of Heresie than most of you yet allow. If it prove that Christ hath set up no Vicechrist, nor universal Subgovernours; Can you deny this to be High-Treason against him? Dr. Barrow hath fully proved it.

Ans. 2. Then if you be not governed by such an Episcopal Colledge, you are a Schismatick and Usurper, unauthorised, as not governed by such a Colledge: No man is governed by that which is not. But there is no such universal governing Colledge. Bishops now govern the world but *per partes & in propriis Provinciis*, as local Governours, as Justices do the Kingdom, and not as an Universal Colledge or Aristocracy. Where is that Colledge that governs you? Which way had you their Mandates? Were they gathered from all Nations of the Christian world? Who compared the Votes? What were the cases put to them? Are you not ashamed to tell sober men of such a Colledge?

Ans. 3. By this you unchurch all the Christian world: For none of them are governed by such a Colledge. All good Christians live in as much concord as confederates, as their imperfections will allow; but none on earth obey an Universal Senate, or Colledge. The Papists do not, for they cut off (saith your Archbishop Bramhall, three fourth parts.) The Protestants are governed by no such Colledge, who know of none, and here by Oath renounce all Forreign Jurisdiction. The Greeks, the Armenians, the Abassines, &c. are none of them so governed: It's a brave Plea for the Catholick Church, which nulleth it, and makes all Christians Schismaticks and no Catholicks. You have no shift but the Papal and Sectarian tricks, to unchurch all save themselves, and call their Sect all the Catholick Church, and then there may possibly be a Colledge at Rome or elsewhere that you may hear from, and be judged by.

§ 13. Saith he, [*This is a very different thing from the arbitrary combinations of Secular Princes.*]

F f 2

Ans.

Ans. 1. Are not *Christian Princes Spiritual* as well as Bishops? I hope you are not ripe for *Hildebrand's Doctrine*, that Kings are but for the Body, and Priests for the Souls, and therefore as far below the Priests, as the body is below the soul, and as the Moon below the Sun.

Ans. 2. What difference is there but accidental, and the different matter of their Offices? Princes are bound by God to promote the Churches Unity and Peace, and to confederate and consult as far as the common good of all the Churches doth require it, and to do nothing against it. And this is it that justifieth and requireth Pastoral Synods.

Ans. 3. But indeed there is a difference between the obligations to Synods, and subjection to them, which was laid on men in one Empire, (and so in other National Churches) and that which is laid on men all over the world for supposed General Councils, or a Colledge, by your fiction: This difference you must not hide.

§. 4. His third proof is from the old use of *Communicatory Letters or Certificates*, which, he saith, is a plain argument of *Communion*, &c.

Ans. 1. Are not all these three proofs the same, *Writing Letters of Church-affairs, Consultation and Communication*?

Ans. 2. Do any of us deny his conclusion, That this proveth communion among them? Are these kind of arguings fit to prove us Schismatics to be ruined? Or is not the world heinously abused by such men? The Question is, *Whether there be an Episcopal Colledge as one Aristocratical Supreme, having power of Legislation and Judgment over the whole Christian world, whom all must obey that will be Christians in the Catholic Church?* And the Papists and these men prove the need of communion, and then think they have proved such an Aristocracy, and our Subjection necessary. Communion must extend as far as we are capable of it. You have communion I think with the National Church of *France*, if not with some Protestant Churches; Are you therefore subject to them? Or can you have no communion but in a common subjection to some Universal Supreme under Christ?

Ans. 3. Reader, It is the effect of error and sin to be self-condemning. These communicatory Letters the Nonconformists are greatly for; that no man may be admitted to communion in any particular Church, without either a personal understanding, owning of his Baptismal Covenant, or a Testimonial that he hath done

done it, and been received into communion with some Church, with whom we have such communion, as is due between several Churches? But our Accusers will rather Silence and utterly ruine us as Malefactors, than grant us this one thing. They huddle over Confirmation without ever trying the knowledg, faith and life of the Confirmed; and utterly opposed and rejected our earnest suit, that the Parish-Ministers *Consent* or *Certificate* (who is supposed to know them better than a Bishop, that never before saw them) might ordinarily be necessary. Not one of a multitude is so much as ceremoniously Confirmed. The Ministers give the Sacrament to they know not whom. Thousands live in the Parish whom he is an utter stranger to. Travellers and Lodgers may come who will, if they be the disciples of *Hobbs*, or *Spinosa*, or utter Infidels, without any Communicatory Letters: Any one that removeth his dwelling into the Parish, is supposed (unless excommunicate) to have right to Communion unknown. I am puzzled with cases which this makes. Some children of Anabaptists, never baptized, at age are called with the rest to the Communion, and admitted by the Priest that never put a question to them. God awakeneth their consciences, and they now ask us, Whether they must be yet baptized, when they have long Communicated? Yet these men that will not endure the practice, do prove *universal Sovereignty* in a Colledg from the ancient use of Communicatory Letters. These be our condemners.

§ 15. Next he confuteth Dr. Barrow, who saith, that a *common Unity of Policy* (or *supreme Regiment*) is no more hence *inferred*, than from *Princes recommending their Subjects to others for trade*. And his answer is, *That all the Churches in the world were united in one body, and one communion*.

Ans. And so are all the Kingdoms of the world, so far as they are Christian: It is the same Christians that are under the power of the *Word* and of the *Sword*, and both now of Christ, the Lord Redeemer. The Kingdoms of the Christian world are the Kingdom of Christ, who is King of Kings and Lord of Lords. Christ is the universal Sovereign to all Christians, and no mortal man or men. So he is over all Churches: Christian Kingdoms and Churches are all bound by Christ, to live as united under one Sovereign. It's true, that Christ hath made Pastors by the Church-Keys, to be Judges of Church-Communion, which is not the

the same thing with that sort of Communion which Princes are the Judges of; which only proveth, that the Offices materially differ. But God never made an *universal Judge* of every Mans Communion, Civil or Ecclesiastick, but Jesus Christ. Must all the Bishops of the world judge whether I am to be baptized, or must receive the Lords Supper? If with some Sectaries, you deny Christ to be the Head of Magistrates as such, you will confess, that God is, and that all the world is the Kingdom of God: And must God needs set up one humane Kingdom or Senate over all the world, to govern at the *antipodes* and the *terra incognita*? If not, why one universal Church-Senate, or Monarch (which is more unreasonable as to *Church-Government* than to *Civil*)?

Great reason commands me to tell you, 1. That if you would not have us know, that it's the *fundamental difference between us and the Papists*, whether there be any universal humane Church supremacy; and but the 2. Whether this be in the Pope? we must know it, whether you will or not.

2. That it's a doleful case, that any King that hates the name of a Civil Monarch of all the world, can be so deluded, as to think that there must be an universal Church-Monarch, or *supreme Senate*, or *Colledg*, which is more impossible.

§. 16. But saith the Confuter of Dr. Barrow, *They are received into all the rights and priviledges of the Christian Communion in the Church whither they went, by being owned Members of the Church from whence they came; which cannot be said of Subjects recommended by the Princes Letters. — not making them free Denizens.*

Ans. 1. This signifieth no more, but that Church-priviledges and Civil priviledges have not the same conditions; which who denieth? But what's this to prove an Universal Sovereignty? Must all the Bishops on earth be sent to judge of every mans Christianity or Testimonials? Whoever in all the world professeth the true Faith, is by baptism to be taken into this one Church of Christ? And yet all the Bishops on earth are not to be consulted before a man be judged meet for Baptism; nor doth the baptizer receive his Commission from them all: Philip baptized the *Eunuch* without a Commission from all the Apostles or Bishops: The *Abassines*, *Copties*, *Jacobites*, *Nestorians*, *Armenians*,

Georgians, Greeks, Papists, &c. all baptize now without a Communion from a Colledg that's taken for the Ruler of all the Christian world.

Ans. 2. The justly recommended by Bishops, are but to be received into the common privileges of Christians, but not into the special privileges of that particular Church, without a further condition. They may have transient Communion of strangers (*Communione peregrinam*), but they may not be Church-Officers, nor have suffrages, as the members have about that Churches affairs, nor in the Election of Bishops and other Officers; nor is the Pastor obliged to the same particular care of every such stranger in point of vigilancy, instruction, reproof, discipline or relief, as of his Flock; nor is a man one of his Flock by such a recommendation and cohabitation. A mutual consent to that particular Church-relation must be a further condition.

And so it is as to Civil Communion. Every Nation is bound to receive a recommended person to all the common Civil privileges of a Man and of a Christian, a subject of the King of all the world; but not to those special privileges of incorporate Bodies, Honours or Offices, which require a further condition, for that would be to the wrong of others, and of the State of which they are not regularly capable. So that your diffimilitude here, is nothing to your purpose.

§ 17. *Sherl.* And if it might not be thought immodest to pass a censure upon so great and deservedly admired a man, I should venture to say, That he was so much bent upon opposing that notion of Church-Unity, which set up a supreme and Sovereign power over the Catholick Church, such a constitutive Regent Head as Mr. B. would have over a National Church (which he hath effectually done beyond all contradiction) that he was not so careful to avoid some expressions, which might seem to reflect on Catholick-communion.]

Ans. 1. It were far better to be free from Immodesty, than from being thought immodest. Who would think that a man that pierdeth for so much mischief to others, did scruple Immodesty? Is it modest to say and unsay, to dispute for so pestilent a Cause, and then to give it up, and confess that Dr. Barrow hath beyond contradiction overthrown it? Do we not all agree in the many sorts of Union and Communion which he describeth? Do you not maintain

tain, that [*the Christian Church is governed by the Episcopal Colledge*]? And yet is it not one Governing Colledge? Do you not say, That the Catholick Church consists of a *pars Imperans* and *pars Subdita*, and that the *united Bishops are this Regent part, which all that will be Members must obey*? Are they *One pars Imperans* as united, or not? If not, they make not the Church *One*: If *one Regent part* to govern the whole, our communion is not enough without subjection, as you profess, and as *One* they must govern; which must be either, 1. By the *major Vote* through the world. 2. Or else by one part joyned with some of the *Quorum* (Pope or Patriarchs) to be instead of a Majority. 3. Or else every one must consent. 4. Or else they govern *per alios* as deputed Officers under them, and not *per se*. And this is the Aristocracy which *Dr. Barrow* so effectually confuteth; and a mere obligation to concord of Princes and Pastors we all maintain, *Quis teneat vultum*, &c. When you know better what to say your self, others may come to know what you mean, and you may be fitter to censure *Dr. Barrow*.

§ 18. Sher. [*'After this I need say nothing to that communion which was maintained between distant Churches and private Christians, who were Members of them, which was to own each other as Sister-churches, and actually communicate as occasion offered, &c.*]

Ans. Who would have thought but that all this while he had been speaking of this only, How these Sister-churches and Members must be united under one universal Regent part? Understand the man he that can, for I confess I cannot.

§ 19. II. Sher. [*'Let us now briefly consider what place there can be for Catholick communion in this broken and divided state of the Church this day: I confess the Divisions of Christendom are sad, we cannot finde any one entire communion in a National, much less in the Universal Church.*]

Ans. 1. Yes, in Spain, and where the Inquisition prevaleth: And when we are all choakt in Jails, your party boasteth of hopes of it here, *Solitudinem faciunt & pacem vocant*.

Ans. 2. There is *essential* communion among all Christians, though not *entire* communion: And *entire*, where there is not communion in all accidents.

§ 20. Sher.

§ 20. Sher. [*But I take that man to be a catholic Christian, not who communicates with all Sects and Parties of Christians (which is Mr. B's notion of a catholic Christian); but he who preserves the communion of the church wherein he lives; and is ready as occasion shall offer, to communicate with all Christian churches, which are neither Schismatical nor Heretical.*]

Ans. 1. It concerns yourself more than us, whom you take to be Catholics. But who would think that these Doctors should at once write Books to prove me a Separatist, and yet accuse me of holding communion with all Sects and Parties of Christians? But even the witness of Christ's Accusers did not agree. A vehement flood of words can make good any contradictions with some men. And all Readers are not wiser nor honest than such Writers.

Ans. 2. Sure I ever except such communicating as maketh me partaker of their sin: I refuse local communion where I cannot have it without a sinful condition, as I do Ministration where I cannot do it without deliberate Lying, Perjury, Church corrupting, and renouncing Repentance.

Ans. 3. Do not the Spaniards and other Papists preserve the communion of the Church wherein they live? And do not Papists, Greeks, Jacobites, and the rest, profess such occasional communion with all Christian Churches, which are not Schismatical or Heretical? And seeing the Nonconformists do all this, why may not they be Catholics also in your account?

Ans. 4. But you know the Question is, Who shall be Judge? They think them Schismatical that are for casting out, excommunicating, and separating from such Ministers and Christians, as you would have thus used. They think those Heretical that would alter the Article of the Catholic Church, and set up a Regent part with Legislation and Judgment over all the Christian world: Almost all parties of Christians think others Schismatical at least. Why did you not put in, [*Those that the Episcopal Colledge of the world shall judge Schismatical or Heretical?*] But if I judge you to be both, and yet lately heard you Preach and Pray, I hope that proveth me not a Separatist? But I am a Separatist, for not separating from those that you separate from, and you are none.

§ 21. Sher. [*By Schismatical I mean those Churches which separate from the National Church wherein they live, without just and necessary*

'necessary reason, which can be nothing less than sinful terms of communion']

Answ. 1. Your *Mt. Thorndike* Epi. saith, That the very name of *National Churches* is barbarous. And that it was the Patriarchal Churches, and Churches diversified by the pre-eminence of Cities, that the Apostles ordained, which order is necessary to Catholick Concord: And so the Bishop of *Canterbury* is a Schismatick for overtopping *London*.

Answ. 2. But which is the National Church? Is it the greater number? Or is it that which is owned by the Civil Power? Which is it in *Hungary*, in the *Turks* or *Persian Dominions*? Is it *Lutheran* or *Calvinist* under the Duke of *Brandenburgh*, or elsewhere, when the Prince and Bishops differ? The *French* Protestants disown the National Church.

Answ. 3. But who is there among us that separateth any further from your National Church, than terms which he judgeth sinful do constrain him? After such a cartload of words to prove such as I am to be Schismaticks, you now openly acquit me, and confess your self a Calumniator, if you cannot prove that I separate from the National Church, further than sinful terms constrain me. And could you think me so much void of Reason, as to take what you have said in this Book for a proof of the lawfulness of all things imposed, named in my first Plea for Peace?

Answ. 4. But have you not here destroyed the foundation of your Church-communion, and your Doctrine? Are there not National Churches that obey not your Universal Colledge? Yea, that condemn one another? Are none of these Schismatical? Are not *Abassia*, *Armenia*, *Georgia*, *Muscovie*, and other such here, quit from Schism, without obeying your Supreme Regent Universal *Pars Imperans*? But this is your ordinary Method.

§ 22. Sherl. [*'And by Hereticks, those which impose any Doctrine as the terms of Communion, which contradicts some plain and express Article of Faith.'*]

Answ. 1. What if they hold, e. g. *Arrianism*, *Socinianism*, *Manichisme*, &c. and do not impose it as terms of Communion; No, nor impose it at all, Are they not Heretical? How gentle are you in some fits?

Answ. 2. What if a Church impose your Principle of [An Episcopal Colledge, which is one Regent Supreme to the Universal Church]

Church] and make this to be the Catholick Church named in the Creed, and so directly corrupt that Article, must all separate from such a Church as Heretical ?

Ans. 3. Your Conclusion fully acquits us from the Accusations of Schism in your Book, and owneth us now as Catholick Christians.

§ 23. Having done with Mr. *Sherlock's* Catholicisme, I shall do that right to the party, as to tell the Reader what Mr. *Thorn-dike* saith, to vindicate their conceit of an Universal Regent Colledge from common scorn, and make it possible.

I. It is supposed that the Apostles governed all the Church (with the Disciples) as a Colledge. II. That they left the power to all the Bishops. III. But that it might be possible to use it, they ordained some Churches to be Heads over the rest, as *Rome*, *Alexandria* and *Antioch*. IV. And that Churches should differ as the civil pre-eminence of their Cities did. V. That among these, *Rome* hath the pre-eminence, especially in the summoning of General Councils, and authorizing them and their Decrees; and so is as Bishop *Bramhall* speaks, *Principium Unitatis*. VI. That these chief City-Bishops represent the inferior. VII. And all Bishops represent all their Churches. And now do not laugh at a Colledge of Bishops of all the world as impossible. May not a few represent all the Bishops of the Earth ?

§ 24. But yet many knots must be untied or cut, if this dream were granted ? 1. What shall we do for a Colledge when the Apostles chief Seats are destroyed, as *Alexandria* and *Antioch* ? 2. Or when they cease to be chief Cities ? 3. Or when they are in the power of Infidel Princes, that will not let them meet or meddle abroad ? 4. And when their nominal Patriarchs all condemn each other, as all the five old ones now do ? 5. And how shall we know which are the ruling Cities in a multitude of Principalities that have no rule over one another ? Yea, when now Cities have no Rule over each other at all in the same Kingdom ? And is it the Pope, or who, that must send to all the chief City-Bishops in the world ?

Reader, Mr. *Sherlocke* was so wise as to break off here ; but those that have opened the Mystery, bring it all to this. 1. The Patriarchs and chief Prelates represent the whole Church ; (you

must not ask who these be, nor who chooseth them.) II. The particular Bishops chosen by —are authorized to tell you the Laws and mind of their Superiors, and to rule you by their Décrees in Councils, or Letters Mandatory. III. The Lay-Chancellors, and Commissaries, and Officials, and Surrogates, and nearest to us, the Parish Priest, is to tell you the mind of the Bishops: And this whole grand design of a Council or dispersed Colledge as one supreme Aristocracy governing all the Christian world, is resolved into the actual *Credit* and *Government* of every Parish-Priest or Lay-Chancellor, &c. that is governed by a Bishop, that is governed by Metropolitans, that are governed by Patriarchs, or no body knows whom: *But a Forreign Jurisdiction it must be.*

C H A P. VII.

§ I. **I** Have done with the beginning, or fundamental part of this Dr's book, which is his end, or last Chapter. I was about to go backward, and answer what he saith of *National*, and then of *Diocesan Churches*; and so to come to his more minute particulars concerning my self: For his book is like a tree with the Branches downward and the Root upward. But to confess my weakness, if it be such, I had not patience enough to endure to open such a rapsody of contradictions and mistakes, or gross fallacies or untruths; nor can I think, that many Readers have patience and leisure any more than I, to peruse an hundred more sheets (or pages either); which would be little enough to shew all the faults and fallacies of his book, as fully as word by word it should be answered.

Who can endure to be large in confuting a man that pleads for a *Government without superiority*? One *pars imperans* and *pars subdita*, and yet no *constitutive Regent part or head*, that knoweth not the difference of a City or Polity, and a meeke Community: That sometimes describeth it but as confederacy, and anon confuteth such as say it is no more: That says and unlays, it is a Polity and it is not: It maketh Laws, as one *pars imperans*,
for

for one Society, and yet is no constitutive governing part : because it is but by *consent*, it's no such constitutive Power : As if the Senate of *Venice*, or the States of *Holland* were no constitutive head, because they govern by consent. But this *consent is commanded of God*. Very true : as if confederacy of Princes and Bishops were not commanded of God, as far as the publick good requireth it, as well as one Regent Colledg. Doth this consent make *them all one Aristocracy*, or *Regent Senate*, or Political Supreme, or not ? If yea, why do you boggle to affirm it ? If not, why do you cavil against Dr. *Barrow*, that denieth it ? Doth this Colledg. make *true Laws obligatory to all the Christian world*, or only draw agreements, which all are bound to observe by Gods Law, which binds us to as much concord as the publick good requireth, and our condition will allow ? If the first, why do you deny them to be the Regent constitutive visible Head of all the Church ? If the latter, again, why do you speak against Dr. *Barrow* and others, for asserting such a Communion as is distinct from subjection ? If you know not the difference between laws and agreements, I'll not repeat what Bishop *Usher* said ; read what *Grotius* saith *de Imper. Sum. Potest.* Plainly, either my ignorance disableth me from finding intelligible sense, or cogent evidence in your book, or yours from writing it. I have lost my labour in reading it, and will not tire the Reader with a particular examination of it.

§. 2. I did also peruse his description of *Diocesan Communion*. But to tell you what an unsatisfactory Mass of words I found, is all the answer I'll give it, save this, That if he dare deny the Bishop to be the constitutive Regent part or head of his *Diocesan Church*, he may hear of it with both ears. And if the Archbishops have no government of the Bishops, it's odd that they swear obedience to them. And are *Diocesan* and *Metropolitan Churches* different from his *Catholick totâ specie* ? Or will they not all at last come to Mr. *Thorndike's*, *Bramhall's*, and such others way, even to a subordination to the Patriarchal Churches, and to the Pope, as *Principium unitatis*, and Patriarch of the *West* ?

Once he made me smile by saying, a *Bishop of Bishops is Antichristian*, because I denied not Apostles to be such, and will not maintain, that they have no successors in the point of overseeing
and

and Ministerial visiting many Churches. Who would think, but this man were less Episcopal than I, and such as I?

§. 3. I did also gather abundance of untruths, mistakes, vain arguings and fallacies, tending to abuse the Reader, out of all his book. But on two accounts I cast them by: 1. Because his sequacious partial party will not read them; and others need them not. Either men will impartially compare my Books with his Answers, or not. If they will not, why should I write more for such? If they will, and yet need any confutation of such a Book as his, they are no Readers for me: I leave them to Teachers that can make them capable of the use of Reason.

2. Chiefly, because this great point of an humane Universal Church-supremacy, for Legislation and Judgment, is of so great and dangerous consequence, that they shall not draw me from the examination of it, nor hide our grand difference about an Article of the Creed, and the essence of the Catholick Church, by turning me to lesser matters. I intend, God willing, hereafter to let the matters of meer Conformity comparatively alone, and further to examine this fundamental difference; Seeing it is evident, that now Satans design is to call the *French* Popery by the name of the Protestant Religion, and the Protestant Religion of the true Church of *England* by the name of Nonconformity and Schism, and to deceive the simple by a noise against the refusers of Episcopacy, Liturgy and Ceremonies. But that noise shall no more divert me from opposing the foundation of Popery.

But if any man desire more against this Accuser, he may find enough already written in one book by Mr. *Humphreys*, and a Conformist, and Mr. *Lobb*, all conjoyned.

F I N I S.

These Books following, written by the same Author, are to be sold by *Tho. Parkhurst*, at the *Bible and Three Crowns*, at the lower end of *Cheapside*.

Baxter's Christian Directory, *Fol.* containing a sum of practical Theology, and Cases of Conscience, in Four parts. 1. Christian Ethicks (or private Duties). 2. Christian Oeconomicks (or Family Duties). 3. Christian Ecclesiasticks (or Church Duties). 4. Christian Politicks (or Duties to our Rulers and Neighbours). The second Edition, with an Alphabetical Table.

———Catholick Theology, plain, pure, peaceable for pacification; in Three Books. 1. Pacifying Principles about Gods Decrees, Fore-knowledg, Providence, Operations, Redemption, Grace, Mans power, Free will, Justification, merits, certainty of salvation, Perseverance.

2. A pacifying Praxis, or a Dialogue about the Five Articles, Justification.

3. Pacifying Disputations against some real Errors, which hinder Reconciliation, *viz.* about Physical predestination, Original sin, the extent of Redemption, sufficient Grace, Imputation of Righteousness.

———Life of Faith; in Three parts. The First is a Sermon preached before his Majesty, and published by his command, with another, for fuller Amplification. The
Se-

Second is Instructions, for confirming Believers in the Christian Faith. The Third is Directions, how to live by Faith, or how to exercise it on all occasions.

— which is the true Church.

— An Apology for the Nonconformists preaching, containing 1. The Reasons of their preaching. 2. An Answer to the Accusations urged as Reasons for the silencing of about 2000. by Bishop *Morley*, and many others. 3. Reasons proving it [the Duty and interest of the Bishops and Conformists, to endeavour earnestly their Restauration.

Two Disputations of Original sin, as from *Adam*. 2. Of Original sin, as from our nearest Parents; by *Richard Baxter*.

22 9 49

128456709
123456709
123456709

William Smith's March 14 1790

~~Letter to James R. [unclear]~~
~~R. 2 [unclear] [unclear]~~

PLD

